

Central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/inflibnet-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3134812>.
Created from inflibnet-ebooks on 2019-06-15 23:19:00.

Translated by Roy J. Deferrari

ἔτσι οἱ ἄλλοι, ἡμεῖς ἀγγέλους· ἔτσι
πάντες ἡμεῖς· ἔτσι τὸ ἀπειλεῖν, ἡμεῖς
εὐχεσθαι· ἔτσι τὸ βάλλειν, ἡμεῖς·
ἔτσι χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον, ἡμεῖς ἔ-
φαρμένον. ἐποίησας σεαυτῷ δι᾽ ἡ-
ρώφα; γινῶθι τὰ ῥήματα τῆ γρα-
φῆς, διεσαλμένον θυρίσιν, ἀλλὰ
τὸ ἐμὴς πίσεως ὑψηλότερα καὶ ἢ π-
ρὸς Φέρομαι. μικρὸν μοι τὸ ποίμνην
ἐπὶ κρημνῶν Φερόμενον. σενὴ μικ-
τὴν λύκοις ἀνεπίδασθαι, πλ-
δεχομένη λησὴν, ἐδὲ ὑπερβαίνομεν
ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξομαί ταύτην εὐοῖς.
τυτέραν, πολλὰς καὶ τῶν νῦν λυ-

THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH

A NEW TRANSLATION

VOLUME 19

THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH

A NEW TRANSLATION

Founded by
LUDWIG SCHOPP

EDITORIAL BOARD

ROY JOSEPH DEFERRARI
The Catholic University of America
Editorial Director

RUDOLPH ARBESMANN, O.S.A.
Fordham University

BERNARD M. PEEBLES
The Catholic University of America

STEPHAN KUTTNER
The Catholic University of America

ROBERT P. RUSSELL, O.S.A.
Villanova College

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE
The Catholic University of America

ANSELM STRITTMATTER, O.S.B.
St. Anselm's Priory

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.
The Catholic University of America

JAMES EDWARD TOBIN
Queens College

GERALD G. WALSH, S.J.
Fordham University

*EUSEBIUS
PAMPHILI
ECCLESIASTICAL
HISTORY*

BOOKS 1-5

Translated by
ROY J. DEFERRARI



THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
Washington, D.C.

NIHIL OBSTAT:

JOHN M. A. FEARNs, S.T.D.

Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR:

✠ FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Archbishop of New York

April 20, 1953

The Nihil obstat and Imprimatur are official declarations that a book or pamphlet is free of doctrinal or moral error. No implication is contained therein that those who have granted the Nihil obstat and Imprimatur agree with the contents, opinions or statements expressed.

Library of Congress Catalog Card No.: 65-27501

Copyright © 1953 by

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS, INC.

All rights reserved

Second Printing 1965

Third Printing 1981

First Paperback Reprint 2005

ISBN-13: 978-0-8132-1445-0 (pbk)

ISBN-10: 0-8132-1445-9 (pbk)

TO MY SON

AUSTIN JOHN

CONTENTS

BOOK ONE

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
1 What the foundation of the Promise is	35
2 A brief summary of the pre-existence and divine nature of our Saviour and Lord, the Christ of God .	37
3 How both the Name of Jesus and that itself of Christ had been known from the first and had been honored by the inspired Prophets	46
4 How there was nothing new or strange in the manner of the religion He proclaimed to all the nations . .	51
5 Concerning the time of His appearance among men	54
6 How in His time, in accordance with prophecy, those rulers who had formerly governed the nation of the Jews in regular succession died out, and Herod was the first foreigner to reign over them	56
7 Concerning the discrepancy which is thought to exist regarding the genealogy of Christ	59
8 Concerning Herod's plot against the children and the nature of the catastrophe that overcame him in life	65
9 Concerning the times of Pilate	69
10 Concerning the high priests of the Jews in whose time Christ performed His teaching	70
11 The testimonies regarding John the Baptist and Christ	72

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
12 Concerning the disciples of our Saviour	75
13 A story concerning the ruler of the Edessenes	76

BOOK TWO

1 On the activity of the Apostles after the Ascension of Christ	83
2 How Tiberius was moved on being informed by Pilate of the story of Christ	88
3 How the message about Christ ran in a short time into all parts of the world	91
4 How, after Tiberius, Caius appointed Agrippa King of the Jews, after punishing Herod with perpetual banishment	92
5 How Philo was sent on an embassy to Caius in behalf of the Jews	93
6 The evils that overwhelmed the Jews after their presumption against Christ	96
7 How Pilate committed suicide	98
8 On the famine in the time of Claudius	99
9 The martyrdom of James the Apostle	99
10 How Agrippa, who was also called Herod, persecuted the Apostles and immediately experienced the divine judgment	100
11 On Theudas the magician	103
12 On Helena, Queen of the Adiabeni	104
13 On Simon Magus	105
14 On the preaching of Peter the Apostle at Rome . .	108
15 On the Gospel according to Mark	109

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
16 How Mark was the first to preach the knowledge of Christ to those in Egypt	110
17 What Philo narrates about the ascetics in Egypt	111
18 The writings of Philo that have come down to us	117
19 The calamity that befell the Jews in Jerusalem on the day of the Passover	119
20 The events that took place in Jerusalem in the time of Nero	120
21 On the Egyptian whom the Acts of the Apostles also have mentioned	121
22 How Paul was sent a prisoner from Judaea to Rome and on making his defense was acquitted of all guilt	122
23 How James who was called the brother of the Lord suffered martyrdom	124
24 How, after Mark, Annianus was the first to be established bishop of the Church at Alexandria	131
25 On the persecution under Nero in which, at Rome, Paul and Peter were adorned with martyrdom in the cause of religion	131
26 How the Jews were assailed by countless evils and how they began the last war against the Romans	134

BOOK THREE

1 The parts of the world in which the Apostles preached Christ	137
2 Who the ruler of the Church at Rome was	139
3 On the Epistles of the Apostles	139
4 On the first successors of the Apostles	141

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
5 On the last siege of the Jews after Christ	144
6 On the famine that oppressed them	146
7 On the prophecies of Christ	152
8 On the signs before the war	155
9 On Josephus and the writings which he left behind	157
10 How he quotes the sacred books	159
11 How, after James, Symeon was the leader of the Church in Jerusalem	161
12 How Vespasian commanded the descendants of David to be sought out	162
13 How Abilius was the second leader of the Alexandrians	162
14 How Anenctetus was the second Bishop of Rome . .	163
15 How, after him, the third was Clement	163
16 On the Epistle of Clement	164
17 On the persecution under Domitian	164
18 On John the Apostle and the Apocalypse	165
19 How Domitian commanded the descendants of David to be destroyed	166
20 On the relatives of our Saviour	167
21 How Cerdo was the third leader of the Church at Alexandria	168
22 How Ignatius was the second of the Church at Antioch	169
23 A narrative about John the Apostle	169
24 On the order of the Gospels	173
25 On the sacred writings that are accepted and those that are not	178

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
26 On Menander the sorcerer	180
27 On the heresy of the Ebionites	182
28 On Cerinthus the heresiarch	184
29 On Nicholas and those named after him	186
30 On the Apostles who were tested in marriage	187
31 On the death of John and Philip	188
32 How Symeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, suffered martyrdom	190
33 How Trajan forbade the Christians to be sought out	193
34 How Evarestus was the fourth leader of the Church at Rome	194
35 How Justus was the third of the Church in Jerusalem	194
36 On Ignatius and his Epistles	195
37 On the evangelists who were still flourishing at that time	200
38 On the Epistle of Clement and the writings falsely ascribed to him	201
39 On the writings of Papias	202

BOOK FOUR

1 Who the bishops at Rome and at Alexandria during the reign of Trajan were	207
2 The sufferings of the Jews in his time	208
3 The apologists for the faith in the time of Hadrian	209
4 The bishops at Rome and Alexandria in his time	210
5 The bishops at Jerusalem from the beginning, from the Saviour to the time mentioned	211
6 The last siege of the Jews under Hadrian	213

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
7 Who the leaders of knowledge, falsely so called, were at that time	214
8 Who the writers of the Church were	219
9 A letter of Hadrian declaring that we are not to be persecuted without a trial	221
10 Who the bishops at Rome and Alexandria in the reign of Antoninus were	222
11 On the leaders of heresy in their times	223
11 On the apology of Justin addressed to Antoninus . .	228
13 A letter of Antoninus addressed to the common council of Asia on our doctrine	228
14 Recollections of Polycarp who was acquainted with the Apostles	230
15 How, in the time of Verus, Polycarp with others suffered martyrdom in the city of Smyrna	233
16 How Justin the philosopher, while preaching the word of Christ in the city of Rome, suffered martyrdom	243
17 On the martyrs whom Justin mentions in his own work	246
18 What writings of Justin have come down to us . .	248
19 Who the leaders of the Church at Rome and at Alexandria were during the reign of Verus	251
20 Who the leaders of the Church at Antioch were . .	251
21 On the writers of the Church who were pre-eminent in these times	252
22 On Hegesippus and what he himself mentions . . .	253
23 On Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, and the letters which he wrote	256

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
24 On Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch	260
25 On Philip and Modestus	261
26 On Melito and what he himself related	262
27 On Apolinarius	266
28 On Musanus	267
29 On the heresy of Tatian	267
30 On Bardesanes the Syrian and his extant works . .	269

BOOK FIVE

Introduction	271
1 The number of those who in the time of Verus underwent the struggle for religion in Gaul, and the nature of this conflict	272
2 How the martyrs, beloved of God, received and ministered to those who had fallen in the persecution	287
3 The nature of the vision that appeared in a dream to the martyr Attalus	289
4 How the martyrs commended Irenaeus in a letter . .	291
5 How God, giving heed to the prayers of our people, sent rain from heaven to Marcus Aurelius Caesar . .	292
6 A list of those who were bishops in Rome	295
7 How even down to those times amazing miracles were performed by the faithful	296
8 How Irenaeus quotes the divine Scriptures	297
9 Those who were bishops in the time of Commodus	301
10 On Pantaenus the philosopher	302
11 On Clement of Alexandria	304
12 On the bishops in Jerusalem	306

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
13 On Rhodo and the dissension against the teaching of Marcion which he described	307
14 On the false prophets of Phrygia	311
15 On the schism that took place at Rome under Blastus	311
16 What is related about Montanus and the false prophets with him	311
17 On Miltiades and the treatises which he composed	320
18 How Apollonius also refuted those in Phrygia and what quotations he made	322
19 Serapion's letter on the heresy of the Phrygians . .	326
20 The discussions with the schismatics at Rome which Irenaeus has left in writing	327
21 How Apollonius suffered martyrdom in Rome . . .	330
22 What bishops were celebrated in these times . . .	332
23 On the controversy which was stirred up at that time over the Passover	333
24 On the disagreement in Asia	334
25 How all came to an unanimous agreement over the Passover	339
26 How much of the polished work of Irenaeus has come down to us	340
27 How much, also, of the others who flourished with him at that time	340
28 On those who first put forth the heresy of Artemon, what was their manner of life, and how they had the audacity to corrupt the holy Scriptures	342

*EUSEBIUS
PAMPHILI*

*ECCLESIASTICAL
HISTORY*

BOOKS 1-5

Translated by

ROY J. DEFERRARI, Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., Litt.D.

The Catholic University of America

INTRODUCTION

EUSEBIUS WAS COMMONLY KNOWN among the ancients as Eusebius of Caesarea or Eusebius Pamphili. The first designation arose from the fact that he was bishop of Caesarea for many years; the second from the fact that he was a close friend and admirer of Pamphilus, a proslyte of Caesarea and a martyr. At least forty contemporaries bore the same name, among which the most famous were Eusebius of Nicomedia, called by Arius the brother of Eusebius of Caesarea; Eusebius of Emesa; and Eusebius of Samosata—and so arose the necessity of distinguishing him from these others by specific designation.

The year of the Edict of Milan, which divides the first from the second epoch of Church history, does like service for the life and for the literary medium of the Church's first historian. According to the growing assent of scholars, 313 marks off chronologically the Alexandrian from the Byzantine period of Greek literature, and it is 313 that cleaves into uneven but appropriate parts the career of Eusebius Pamphili. In training and in literary taste Eusebius belongs to the earlier time. Officially and in literary productivity he belongs to the later. It was shortly after 313 that Eusebius became a bishop, as it was for the most part after 313 that his works were actually composed. Of events contemporary with these later years Eusebius recorded much that is valued, but it is for what he tells of the earlier period—of the days before the Peace

of the Church—that he looms so large in the history of history and of literature. Through him—through him almost alone—are preserved to us the feeble memories of an age that died with himself.

Of the facts of his life we know little. Neither the place nor the year of his birth is known. The best conjecture makes Palestine his native land and assigns to the period 260-264 the date of his birth. Caesarea in Palestine may have been his native city. All the known associations of his youth, at any rate, and the chief activities of his maturity are linked with her. He was certainly not born a Jew, but that he was born a Christian we do not know. His parents, whether pagan or Christian, were not of high rank. The fact that Arius, when writing to Eusebius of Nicomedia, refers to his namesake of Caesarea as 'your brother who is in Caesarea' cannot with confidence be taken literally. Arius might well call them brothers because they were associated in theological sympathies as well as in episcopal office. Of his parentage and relationship, then, essentially nothing is known.

At Caesarea in Eusebius' youth lived the learned priest Pamphilus. A native of Phoenicia and at one time a student of Alexandria, he had been ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Agapius of Caesarea, and had there established a school and library where the Bible was studied, and the scholarly tradition of Origen preserved. To this school came Eusebius as pupil, and in this library, which seems to have been unrivaled in Christian circles, he laid the foundation of his future work. A common enthusiasm drew master and pupil together. They became most intimate friends, co-workers in the acquisition of books and in the acquisition of the knowledge that these books contained, united and inspired in both these enterprises by the deepest reverence for Origen. These were the formative years and these the master influences of Eusebius as we know him, and the memory of both Origen

and Pamphilus stands out large in his works—Origen in the encyclopaedic sweep of Eusebius' scholarly interests and Pamphilus in the very name which his grateful pupil assumed—Eusebius of Pamphilus (Eusebius Pamphili). 'In the midst of all this glorious company,' writes Eusebius, 'shone forth the excellency of my lord Pamphilus; for it is not meet that I should mention the name of that holy and blessed Pamphilus without styling him "my lord."'¹

This time of peaceful industry was at length affected by the conflict of the world outside. Paganism was making its last stand against the Church, and, in the violence of the struggle, the most unwarlike of Christian scholars could not remain undisturbed. It has been said that had Diocletian died before 303 he would have taken his place among the rulers whose general tolerance helped Christianity to obtain its victory. As it is, his name is identified with the world's most terrible persecution of the Church. This persecution stretched from 303 to 310, and in this time of the Church's transition from the old order to the new, the earliest of her historians was frequently absent from Caesarea. Details of his movements have not come down to us. Stories creditable and discreditable to him and equally without foundation flourished in the poverty of real evidence. We do know of his presence in Tyre and in the Thebais during this time, for he describes as an eye witness and with deep emotion the martyrdoms that the persecution visited on these unhappy districts. We also know that Pamphilus was in prison from November 307 until February 310, and that Eusebius, despite the peril to himself, visited his master and co-worker in prison. It is to this period that the first five books of the *Apology for Origen* were written by both in common. After Pamphilus had suffered martyrdom in 310, Eusebius added the sixth book to the *Apology*, and wrote the biography of Pamphilus.

¹ *Mart Pal.*, ed. Cureton, p. 37.

There is no conclusive evidence that Eusebius himself shared in this imprisonment or that he escaped martyrdom by some unworthy concession such as offering sacrifice to pagan divinities. In contemporary literature many innuendos are directed at Eusebius to the latter effect, but no direct charge is ever made. Sometime during this period Eusebius visited Egypt, apparently after the martyrdom of Pamphilus in the latest and fiercest days of the persecution. If Eusebius suffered imprisonment at any time, it was after his visit to Egypt, and in that event the general amnesty in the spring of 310 would have effected his own release.

Shortly after the end of the persecution and the restoration of peace, sometime between 313 and 315, Eusebius was elected by unanimous consent to the vacant see of Caesarea. Eusebius himself mentions Agapius as the last bishop, and there is no reason to doubt that Eusebius was his immediate successor.

Among the earliest results of the peace was the erection of a magnificent church at Tyre under the direction of Eusebius' friend, Bishop Paulinus. Eusebius, on being invited, agreed to give the inaugural address.² Although he does not actually name himself as the author, his identity as such is quite clear. This oration, which is of considerable length, is a paean of thanksgiving over the restitution of the Church, of which the beautiful basilica at Tyre was both the first fruit and the type.

Eusebius was bishop of the church of Caesarea for more than a quarter of a century, and during this period he apparently won the respect and admiration of all. One attempt was made to transfer him to a more important center, but Eusebius himself foiled the attempt. He died still Bishop of Caesarea.

In the early part of Eusebius' episcopacy, the Church was threatened with still another persecution. When Eusebius spoke at the dedication of the new church at Tyre, the two

² Cf. *H.E.* 10.4

emperors, Constantine and Licinius, were apparently at peace with each other. In 314, however, they went to war with each other, and continued until Licinius was defeated in 323. The persecution of the Church appears to have been launched by Licinius soon after the dedication at Tyre, and continued until he was overcome by Constantine. This persecution is not to be compared with the recent attack by Diocletian. It was only local and seems never to have been very severe, although a few bishops met their death on one ground or another. Palestine and Egypt appear to have suffered but little.

As Bishop of Caesarea, Eusebius became inevitably involved in another struggle—this time a theological one. About the 318, while Alexander was Bishop of Alexandria, the so-called Arian controversy broke out in that city, and soon involved the entire Eastern Church. Arius was himself not the real author of the heresy that bore his name, but rather his instructor Lucian, from whom he learned its essentials. Lucian was a very spiritual as well as a very learned man. He founded an exegetico-theological school at Antioch, which for several years was outside the communion of the orthodox Church in that city, but made its peace with the Church and was recognized by it shortly before Lucian suffered martyrdom. Those who in the early days of the heresy were known as staunch Arianists had all been disciples of Lucian, and were carrying on their master's principles. Besides Arius they included Eusebius of Nicomedia, Asterius, and others. All the ancient Church historians, although differing as to the immediate occasion of the controversy, agree that Arius was excommunicated by a council which met at Alexandria, and that both he and Bishop Alexander sent letters to the other churches, the one complaining of his harsh treatment and striving to secure followers of his teachings, and the latter defending his own course. It is clear that at an early stage

the sympathies of Eusebius of Caesarea were enlisted on the side of Arius. According to his namesake of Nicomedia, he was especially zealous in support of the Arian doctrine at this time, but this testimony of a strong partisan may well be suspect. The attitude of Eusebius of Caesarea suggests repeatedly that he was influenced rather by personal feeling and an earnest desire to procure liberal treatment for Arius than by any agreement with his views. In any case, he wrote to Alexander, protesting the deposition of Arius, and insisting that Alexander had misrepresented the opinions of Arius. Two neighboring bishops of important sees, Theodotus of Laodicea and Paulinus of Tyre, also took up the cause of Arius. In a letter addressed to Alexander of Constantinople, Alexander of Alexandria complains of three Syrian bishops—clearly meaning Eusebius of Caesarea and his two allies—for having fanned the flame of sedition. On the other hand, Arius claimed that all the bishops of the East, mentioning Eusebius of Caesarea and others by name, were on his side.³ Thus, when a synod convened at Alexandria by Alexander deposed Arius, he appealed to Eusebius and others to interfere in his behalf. The Syrian bishops convened and decided in favor of the restoration of Arius. However, they worded their decision very cautiously. They thought that Arius should be permitted to gather his congregation about him as formerly, but they insisted that he render obedience to Alexander and they urged that he be admitted to communion with him.⁴

Such, then, was Eusebius' position in the controversy. He strove to keep to the middle of the road. To maintain with some of the Fathers and certain modern scholars that Eusebius was always throughout his whole life a pronounced Arian is not consistent with certain facts: both contemporary and later

³ Theodoret, *H.E.* 1.4.

⁴ Sozomen, *H.E.* 1.15.

Fathers were divided as to his orthodoxy; except for certain periods, he was honored highly by the Church in the following centuries; he was even canonized; he solemnly signed the Nicene Creed with its expressed condemnation of the distinctive doctrines of Arius; finally, in none of his works is there any statement which may be stamped as definitely heretical; moreover, in all his later works he is thoroughly orthodox in his expressions, and he explicitly rejects the two main theses of the Arians—that there ‘was a time when the Son of God was not,’ and that He was ‘produced out of nothing.’

The Council of Nicaea, at the request of the emperor, met in 325. At this council Eusebius took a leading part. There is some speculation among scholars as to why Eusebius should have been singled out for such an important role. It could not have been due to his bishopric, because, although Caesarea was important, it did not rank with the great sees, ‘the apostolic thrones’ of Christendom—Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria.⁵ It probably was due to any one or all of the following reasons: Eusebius was beyond question the most learned man and the most famous living writer in the Church at this time; he was a very close friend of the great emperor, whose entire confidence he enjoyed (how this intimacy first developed is not known); finally, he was not a pronounced partisan of either side, as represented by Alexander of Alexandria and Eusebius of Nicomedia. At any rate, Eusebius occupied the first seat to the emperor’s right and delivered the opening address to Constantine.

A description of the opening scene of the council is given by Eusebius in his *Vita Constantini* 3.10ff. The emperor entered in all pomp and ceremony and took his seat. A bishop, who sat next to him on his right, arose and delivered the opening oration in his honor. The emperor replied with a

⁵ *Ibid.* 1.17.

brief address in Latin. There can be little or no doubt but that this bishop was Eusebius, although Theodoret⁶ says that the opening address was delivered by Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, and Theodore of Mopsuestia and Philostorgius assign it to Alexander of Alexandria. But Sozomen⁷ says explicitly that it was Eusebius of Caesarea, and Eusebius himself, while not naming the speaker, refers to him as he did to the orator at the dedication of Paulinus' church at Tyre, and makes it clear that it was himself. Furthermore, in his *Vita Constantini*,⁸ he tells the reader that he had in the midst of an assembly of the servants of God directed an oration to the emperor on the occasion of the ruler's *vicennalia* (325). It has been suggested that the discrepancies in the reports may be due to the possibility that the two great patriarchs, Eustathius and Alexander, addressed a few words to the emperor first, and then Eusebius followed with the oration of the occasion. Unfortunately, this oration is no longer extant, but a good idea of its nature may be gathered from the oration delivered by Eusebius at the emperor's *tricennalia*, which still exists under the title *De laudibus Constantini*, and from the general tone of his *Vita Constantini*. On this basis we would say that it undoubtedly was a panegyric, extremely florid and fulsome.

When the main subject for which the council had met came up, Eusebius again took a prominent part. He himself has left to posterity an account of his actions at this stage in a letter of explanation that he afterwards wrote to his own church in Caesarea. He placed before the council the Creed in use in the Caesarean church, which had been handed down from his predecessors in the episcopacy, and which he himself had been taught at his baptism, and in which he, both as a

6 H.E. 1.7.

7 H.E. 1.19.

8 1.1.

presbyter and a bishop, had instructed others. The emperor was satisfied with the orthodoxy of this Creed, but he inserted the single word *homooúision* (of the same substance), and gave explanations of its meaning which quieted the scruples of Eusebius. The Fathers gathered in council took this as their starting point and made other important insertions and alterations. Most important of all, they appended an anathema directly condemning Arian doctrines. Eusebius finally subscribed, but before doing so he demanded more clarification of three expressions: 'of the substance of the Father,' 'begotten, not made,' and 'of the same substance.' He had little scruple in assenting to the final anathema, because the Arian expressions which it condemned were not Scriptural and he considered that almost all the confusion and disturbance of the churches had arisen from the use of non-Scriptural phrases. In writing this letter, Eusebius was trying to explain to the Caesareans that he would resist to the last any vital change in the traditional Creed of his church, but that he had subscribed to the alterations, on being assured of their innocence, so as not to appear to be contentious.

The healing of the Meletian schism and the settlement of dispute regarding the time for observing Easter were also important reasons for assembling this council. Many assume that Eusebius was very prominent in these controversies also, but there are no records of the part which Eusebius took in these transactions.

The Council of Nicaea did not bring the Arian controversy to an end. In fact, the final peace of the Church seemed as far away as ever. In three controversies with three distinguished antagonists and anti-Arians Eusebius took a more or less prominent part, and his reputation, whether justly or not, has suffered greatly as a result.

Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, was a strong supporter of the Nicene Creed and a vigorous foe of Arianism. He had

attacked the teachings of Origen, of whom Eusebius was a loyal defender, and had charged Eusebius himself with faithlessness to the doctrines of Nicaea. Eustathius, in turn, was accused by Eusebius of Sabellianism. To the historian Socrates the doctrines of the two antagonists seemed to be practically identical, but Christendom in general regarded them as the two principals in the quarrel. A synod, composed chiefly of bishops with Arian or semi-Arian tendencies, was assembled at Antioch in 330 to consider the charge of Sabellianism which had been raised against Eustathius. He was deposed and the see of Antioch accordingly became vacant. The assembled bishops proposed Eusebius of Caesarea as his successor, and wrote to the emperor in support of the appointment. But Eusebius declined the honor, citing the rule of the Church, as an apostolic tradition, forbidding translations from one see to another. Euphronius was later elected.

The next stage of the Arian controversy finds Eusebius in conflict with Athanasius, a far worthier foe than Eustathius. We will not discuss in detail the disgraceful intrigues of the Arians and Meletians against Athanasius. Suffice it to say that the emperor summoned Athanasius to appear before an assemblage of bishops at Caesarea to meet the charges brought against him. Theodoret⁹ states that Constantine was induced to name Caesarea by the Arian party, which selected it because the enemies of Athanasius were in a majority there. The emperor, however, may well have given the preference to Caesarea because he placed the greatest confidence in the moderation of Eusebius, its bishop. Athanasius excused himself from attending, for he believed that there was a conspiracy against him and that he would not receive justice there. This was in 334. It is interesting to note that Athanasius does not mention this synod in his *Apology*.

The next year, 335, Athanasius received a final and angry

⁹ *H.E.* 1.26.

summons from Constantine to appear before an assembly of bishops at Tyre. Theodoret conjectures that the emperor changed the place of meeting out of regard for the fears of Athanasius, who looked with suspicion on Caesarea because of its bishop. The scenes at the synod of Tyre form the most striking and the most shameful chapter in the Arian controversy. In spite of the probable exaggerations of the Athanasian party from which our knowledge is chiefly derived, the proceedings will always remain a terrible shame to Eusebius of Nicomedia and his fellow intriguers. But there is no basis whatsoever to suppose that Eusebius of Caesarea took an active part in this chicanery. Athanasius mentions him rarely and never with any special bitterness. Whenever the 'Eusebians' are mentioned, the adherents of his Nicomedian namesake are meant. Yet, although in all probability not engaging in and possibly ignorant of their plots, our Eusebius was certainly used as a tool by the more unscrupulous and violent followers of Arius, and he must bear the blame of complying too easily with their actions. The proceedings were suddenly brought to an end by the disappearance of Athanasius, who sailed away to Constantinople to appeal in person to the emperor. The synod condemned him by default.

While the bishops were in the midst of their session at Tyre, the emperor sent an urgent summons calling upon them to take part in the approaching festival at Jerusalem.¹⁰ This was the *tricennalia* of Constantine. No one after the Emperor Augustus, the founder of the Empire, had reigned for thirty years. As Eusebius says, Constantine had a fondness for magnificent ceremonial, and here was a noble occasion.¹¹ Constantine marked the occasion by dedicating a new and splendid basilica on the site of Calvary. The principal persons present graced the festival by a series of orations. Among these

10 Cf. *V.C.* 4.41ff.

11 Cf. *V.C.* 4.40.

Eusebius played a conspicuous part, being much more at ease in the congenial atmosphere of this dedication festival than in the midst of the intrigues of the synod of Tyre. He speaks of the assemblage at Tyre as a mere episode of the festival at Jerusalem. Eusebius says that the emperor was very anxious to put an end to the quarrels that were tearing the Church apart and hoped to bring the discordant elements together through this festival. This interpretation of the emperor's motives is confirmed by Constantine's own letter to the synod at Tyre. Eusebius was very much impressed by the celebration, and speaks¹² of it as the greatest synod assembled by Constantine 'after that first council' (Nicaea).

Arius and Euzoius had presented a confession of faith to the emperor, seeking readmission to the Church. When the emperor was satisfied that this document was in harmony with the faith of Nicaea, he sent them to Jerusalem, requesting the synod to consider their confession of faith and restore them to communion. Thus, Arius and his followers were taken back into the Church at Jerusalem.

Athanasius had not fled to Jerusalem in vain. Although Constantine desired peace in his empire and in the Church, he was not insensible to justice, and he became convinced, on giving ear to Athanasius, that a grave miscarriage of justice had occurred. Scarcely had the bishops at the dedication festival carried out the emperor's command as expressed in his first letter, when they received another of a very different temper. The emperor addressed himself 'to the bishops that had assembled at Tyre'; described their proceedings as 'tumultuous and stormy'; and summoned them without delay to Constantinople. Only the leaders of the Eusebian party, including Eusebius himself, obeyed. The others retired to their homes. Of the principal events which occurred at Constantinople, namely, the banishment of Athanasius and

12 *V.C.* 4.47.

death of Arius, we need speak briefly only of the former. The accusers of Athanasius said nothing on this occasion about his alleged immoralities for which he had been condemned at Tyre, but made a new trivial charge against him, and he was banished to Gaul. There has been much speculation as to why Constantine acted as he did. The most probable explanation is that Athanasius' absence would calm the trouble in the Alexandrian church. In any case, Athanasius was not recalled from banishment until after Constantine's death. The chief work of the synod was the condemnation of Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, an uncompromising opponent of the Arians, who had written a book in reply to the Arian Asterius 'the sophist,' in which his zeal against Arian doctrines forced him into expressions that had a strong savor of Sabellianism. Proceedings against him were inaugurated at Jerusalem and were continued at Constantinople, where he was condemned of Sabellianism and deposed from his bishopric. Eusebius apparently took a prominent part in this affair. Moreover, Eusebius was persuaded to undertake a refutation of the heretic, and produced two works against Marcellus.

It is important to note that, although Eusebius during these years was so continuously struggling against one or another of the members of the anti-Arian party, there is no evidence to show that he ever deviated from the doctrinal stand which he took at the Council of Nicaea. From that time on he never consciously supported Arianism, and never opposed Nicene orthodoxy. But anti-Sabellianism influenced him all the time, and his rather firm type of orthodoxy was colored only by its decidedly anti-Sabellian emphasis.

Eusebius did find some very congenial employment while he was in Constantinople. The celebration of the emperor's *tricennalia* had not yet ended. Eusebius delivered a panegyric which he afterwards appended to his *Life of Constantine*. It was probably at this same time, although on an earlier day,

that he delivered before the emperor his discourse on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, perhaps even spoken previously at the dedication itself.

In all probability, Eusebius had never met Constantine personally before the Council of Nicaea. Here, however, Eusebius stood high in the emperor's favor, as the prominent position assigned to him shows, and henceforth there appears to have been no interruption in their friendly relations.

The great Constantine died on May 22, 337, in Nicomedia, his former capital, less than two years after the celebration of his *tricennalia*. Soon after, Eusebius followed his imperial friend at the advanced age of nearly eighty years. Various evidence points to late in 339, or early in 340. None of the details of his last moments is known.

His literary activity continued at its fast pace even to the end. Four years at most elapsed between his last visit to Constantinople and his death. Within this short period and at his advanced age, he composed the *Panegyric*, the *Life of Constantine*, the treatise *Against Marcellus*, and the companion piece *On the Theology of the Church*. He may have had in hand at the same time other unfinished works such as the *Theophania*. There are no signs of failing mental vigor in these works.

The works of Eusebius may be divided conveniently as follows: A. Historical; B. Exegetical; C. Apologetic; D. Doctrinal; E. Letters; F. Homilies. For precise grouping, the foregoing or any assembly of subdivisions, for that matter, is not a satisfactory scheme, since some of Eusebius' works have an equally clear title to inclusion under several heads; but it serves to suggest something of that astounding range of labors that beyond historiography touch every corner of theology cultivated up to his time.

A. Historical.

- (1) *Life of Pamphilus* (lost).
- (2) A collection of *Ancient Martyrdoms* (lost).
- (3) *On the Martyrs of Palestine*.
- (4) *Chronicle*.
- (5) *Church History*.
- (6) *Life of Constantine*.

B. Exegetical.

- (7) Commissioned by the emperor to prepare fifty copies of the Bible for use in the churches of Constantinople.
- (8) Sections and Canons.
- (9) Labors of Pamphilus and Eusebius in editing the Septuagint.
- (10-13) Of (a) *The Interpretation of the Ethnological Terms in the Hebrew Scriptures*, (b) *Chorography of Ancient Judea with the Inheritances of the Ten Tribes*, (c) *A Plan of Jerusalem and the Temple*, (d) *On the Names of Places in the Holy Scriptures*, only the last is extant.
- (14) *On the Nomenclature of the Book of Prophets*.
- (15) *Commentary on the Psalms* (missing in part).
- (16) *Commentary on Isaias*.
- (17-22) Commentaries on other books of Holy Scripture, of some of which we may have extracts.
- (23) *Commentary on St. Luke* (extracts alone preserved).
- (24) *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* (not extant).
- (25) *Commentary on Hebrews* (a possible single fragment alone preserved).

- (26) *On the Discrepancies of the Gospel* (an epitome and some extracts from the original are preserved).
- (27) *General Elementary Introduction*.

C. *Apologetic*.

- (28) *Against Hierocles*.
- (29) *Against Porphyry* (not extant).
- (30) *Praeparatio evangelica*.
- (31) *Demonstratio evangelica* (Of the twenty books, the last ten, with the exception of a fragment of Book 15, are lost).
- (32) *Praeparatio ecclesiastica* (lost).
- (33) *Demonstratio ecclesiastica* (lost).
- (34) *Two Books of Objection and Defense* (lost).
- (35) *Theophania, or Divine Manifestation* (except for a few fragments of the original, extant only in a Syriac version).
- (36) *On the Numerous Progeny of the Ancients* (not extant).

D. *Dogmatic*.

- (37) *The Apology for Origen* (only first book extant).
- (38) *Against Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra* (authenticity doubted).
- (39) *On the Theology of the Church* (authenticity doubted).
- (40) *On the Paschal Festival* (a long fragment survives).
- (41) A treatise against the Manichaeans (existence implied by Epiphanius, *Haer.* 61.21).

E. *Letters*.

- (42) *To Alexander of Alexandria*.

- (43) *To Euphrasion, or Euphration.*
- (44) *To the Empress Constantia.*
- (45) *To the Church of Caesarea* (after the Council of Nicaea).

F. Homilies.

- (46) *At the Dedication of the Church in Tyre.*
- (47) *At the Vicennalia of Constantine* (not extant).
- (48) *On the Sepulchre of the Saviour* (not extant).
- (49) *At the Tricennalia of Constantine.*
- (50) *In Praise of the Martyrs.*
- (51) *On the Failure of Rain* (lost).

The mere recital of the works listed above is an impressive index to the industry of their author. That so much has perished occasions no surprise, of course, to anyone familiar with the posthumous fortunes of other ancient authors. That so much of Eusebius' work remains is a tribute to the good sense of the centuries that followed his death.

At present we are chiefly concerned with the historical writings of Eusebius. Eusebius probably wrote his *Chronicle* before the persecution of 303. Its full title is *Chronological Tables, to Which Is Prefixed an Epitome of Universal History Drawn from Various Sources* as he himself tells us in the beginning of his *Eclogae Propheticae*. An introduction, now designated as the first book, contains short summaries of the history of the Chaldaeans, based on Alexander Polyhistor, Abydenus, and Josephus; of the Assyrians, drawn from Abydenus, Castor, Diodorus, and Cepdalaion; of the Hebrews, taken from the Old Testament, Josephus, and Clement of Alexandria; of the Egyptians, based on Diodorus, Manethus, and Porphyrius; of the Greeks, taken from Castor, Porphyrius, and Diodorus; and of the Romans, drawn from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus, and Castor. The more important

part of the work is the second book, with its chronological tables and its epitome of universal history.

In his *Praeparatio evangelica*,¹³ Eusebius accounts for the interest that Christians felt in the study of comparative chronology. In substance he says that, if heathen opponents contrasted the antiquity of their rites with the newness of the Christian religion, the Christian apologists could reply by proving that the most celebrated legislators and philosophers, whom they thought the font of their religious ideas, flourished later than the Hebrew legislator and the other Prophets who had foretold the coming of Christ, and who had taught a religion of which the Christian was the legitimate continuance. And so Eusebius argues in this section of the *Praeparatio evangelica*, quoting largely from preceding writers who had proved the greater antiquity of the Jews, namely, Josephus, Tatian, Clement of Alexandria, and especially Africanus. Africanus had already discovered synchronisms between sacred and profane history, and had published the chronological work which Eusebius used as a model and to a great extent for the materials of his own *Chronicle*.

How Eusebius arranged the details of the strictly chronological part of his work cannot be ascertained, since the translations, which are alone preserved, are not made from the original but from a revision which appeared shortly after the death of Eusebius. In the chronological tables, the years of Abraham are numbered with years of the reigns of kings, and sometimes those of other periods are combined with them synchronously in parallel columns. With these columns, varying in number through the centuries until we have only the years of the emperors parallel with the Olympians and the years of Abraham, are incorporated important dates taken from Jewish and profane history.

As we have said above, Eusebius is dependent here largely

¹³ 10.9.

upon Africanus. We are not justified, however, in assuming as Scaliger did that Eusebius copied Africanus slavishly in every place where he did not express himself as in utter disagreement with him. There are convincing indications to show that Eusebius views his material much more critically. He avoids that division into world eras which is connected with the millennium theory, and he does not begin with the creation of the world but with the first year of Abraham (2016/5 B.C.). That Eusebius is fully aware of the difficulties of his task we see at the very beginning of his work. He tells us that we must not expect minute accuracy from such an investigation as he is about to enter upon. He says that our Lord's words, 'It is not for you to know the times and the seasons,' are applicable not only to the end of the world, but also to the knowledge of all times and seasons. In the case of the Greeks, he presents the difficulties that arise from the comparatively recent beginning of their civilizations and quotes the well-known story in Plato's *Timaeus*, that the Greeks were but children. As for the Egyptians and the Chaldaeans, difficulties arise from the fables of which their early history is full. And even Hebrew chronology is not free from difficulties of its own. The solutions for these problems represent what he considers as sound judgment on the part of his forerunners and sometimes his own independent consideration. It was much easier for Eusebius to maintain historical accuracy in the early periods of his *Chronicle*, where he could follow trustworthy historians, than in the later periods after these reliable sources had come to an end, and he had to make a way for himself as best he could. In the latter case, Eusebius only excerpted later authors, and, regardless of the efficiency of this procedure for the establishment of a chronology, by his care and good judgment rescued much valuable historical material from destruction.

Eusebius' second great historical work is the ten books of

the *Ecclesiastical History* (*Ekklesiastikè historía*), an expansion of the last part of the *Chronicle*. As in the case of the *Chronicle*, the *Ecclesiastical History* possesses no continuous historical narrative, but its whole subject matter is inserted, as it were, into a chronological framework.

The popular translation of the title (*Ekklesiastikè historía*) as *Church History* must not lead us to believe that it was Eusebius' purpose to relate the fortunes of the Christian Church from the time of our Saviour to his own times. To emulate profane historiography in the grand style could not enter the mind of a Christian at this period, for such a procedure would savor too much of the spirit of the profane, and would not befit a record of the Church of God. *Historía* is used here by Eusebius in its most general sense, to be compared in a way with the titles *Pantodapè* or *Poikíle historía*, and Porphyry's *Philosóphos historía*. It signifies the collection of material handed down, as Eusebius also calls the collected subject matter of the most varied character in the *Praeparatio evangelica* and *Demonstratio evangelica historia*.¹⁴ The fact that Eusebius in his *Church History* quotes so many excerpts directly, as he does also in the *Praeparatio evangelica*, suits this kind of *historía*, but not the strict forms of historiography which Sozomen strives to follow. It is also in keeping with the author's undefined and free interpretation of *historía*, when in his proemium he describes the framework into which he intends to place his material.

The work gives no indication that it was written at the suggestion of anyone else. If Constantine had prompted Eusebius to the task, Eusebius would hardly have passed over this fact in silence, for elsewhere in his writings he seems only too glad to parade the flatteries of his imperial patron. In the preface his own words suggest simply what we have stated above, that it grew out of his previous work, the *Chronicle*.

¹⁴ Cf. *Praep. ev.* 1.6.7.

He speaks of it as an expansion of the narrative which he had given in epitome in that work. Thus, in the opening words, he sums up its contents as follows, placing the chronological element in the forefront: 'The successions of the holy Apostles together with the times which have been accomplished from the days of our Saviour to our own age.'

After his introduction, Eusebius proposes to take up the following topics: (1) The succession of bishops in the most important sees; (2) Christian teachers and writers; (3) Heretics; (4) The punishments which came upon the Jewish people because of their execution of Jesus; (5) The persecutions of the Christians; (6) The martyrs and the deliverance wrought by the Saviour in the author's own day.

Eusebius is dependent upon ancient models for the plan of his work. The *diadochai* of the bishops correspond to the *diadochai* of the schools of philosophy. Christian teachers and heretics are treated from a literary historical viewpoint, their chronology being fixed, together with a list of their works, according to the manner of Alexandrian scholarship. In a similar spirit are added long verbatim citations by way of documentary evidence. As for events over and above such as have been mentioned above, only the judgment on the Jews, the Christian persecutions, and the final victory of Christianity are treated. All the material is approached from the point of view that the history of the Church is at the same time its vindication, and proves it to be a divine institution.

The *Ecclesiastical History*, as we know it today, is not in its original form. Many events of importance occurred in such rapid succession after the year 311 that Eusebius was obliged several times to alter and amplify the end of his work. E. Schwartz, partly from indications in the text, and partly from manuscript evidence, has concluded that there were four editions, portions of which he has attempted to reconstruct. In his last edition, Eusebius brought the narrative

down to 323, the year in which Constantine became sole emperor.

The *Ecclesiastical History* is chiefly responsible for perpetuating the name of Eusebius. It was received with enthusiasm on its first appearance. The six or seven ancient manuscripts (ninth to eleventh centuries) show an intercrossing of variants which could hardly have taken place except in a rich and ramified tradition of an early date. The work must have been copied frequently even in the first centuries after its publication. The history of the ancient Church, of which we would know very little indeed without this work, lived on in the memory of men as pictured by Eusebius, and almost all later descriptions are closely allied to his, or are even direct imitations. This holds true alike for the Greek East and the West where the translation by Rufinus had a wide circulation.

Eusebius' less important works of historiography may be passed over more briefly. A collection of the ancient acts of the martyrs (*Synagôgê ton archaïon martyriôn*) was a preliminary exercise to the writing of the *Ecclesiastical History*. Although this work is now lost, most of its material, at least in an abridged form, was included in the *Ecclesiastical History*.

A work on the martyrs of Palestine (*Peri ton en Palaistîne martyresanton*), which describes the martyrdoms in Palestine during the persecution of Diocletian, has survived in two recensions. The shorter recension is always edited with the *Ecclesiastical History* and is found in several manuscripts of that work, placed after the eighth or tenth books. The longer recension is preserved in its entirety only in a Syriac translation. Certain portions, however, are extant also in Greek.

Eusebius in his *Martyrs of Palestine* speaks as follows about the lost biography of Pamphilus (*Peri tou biou Pamphilou*): 'The rest of the triumphs of his virtue, requiring

a longer narration, we have already before this given to the world in a separate work in three books, of which his life is the subject.' He refers to it again three times in his *Ecclesiastical History*.¹⁵ St. Jerome likewise refers to it several times,¹⁶ in one case (the last) describing it as containing '*tres libros elegantissimos*,' and giving a short extract from the third book, the only surviving fragment. From the standpoint of literary history, the loss of this biography is especially serious. We could scarcely apply the term '*elegantissimos*' to the surviving works of Eusebius, and we have enough respect for St. Jerome's literary taste to believe that he could not have used the superlative without some reason. In this work, Eusebius's main and probably only source was his personal knowledge of Pamphilus. This circumstance, together with Eusebius' intense admiration for his friend, must have co-operated in causing Eusebius to employ his very best style. Any consideration of outside sources could not have interfered with his development of the theme.

The *Life of Constantine* (*Eis tòn bíon tou makariou Konstantínou basiléos*) in four books should not strictly be placed among the historical works. It is rather an encomium in panegyrical style, restricted in particular to the pious deeds of the emperor. The literary character of the work would stand out more clearly if its original draft were still preserved. But, as G. Pasquali has shown, the original form of the work was considerably enlarged by additions, above all through the incorporation of documents. Only with such modifications has the work been handed down to us. Regarding the authenticity of the documents contained in this eulogy (e.g., edicts and letters of the emperor), which were questioned by Crivelucci and others, there can be no doubt. Their genuine character has been ably defended, especially

¹⁵ 6.32; 7.32; 8.13.

¹⁶ *Ep.* 34; *Op.* I, p. 154ff; *Vir ill.* 81; *Rufin.* 1.9.

by I. A. Heikel. Eusebius saw in the Emperor Constantine a new Moses, destined by God to lead the people of God from oppression into freedom. He heralds the emperor as the powerful promoter and protector of the Church. In the spirit of the rhetorical panegyric, Eusebius describes Constantine's acts, giving them a one-sided coloring, and omitting whatever does not fit in with the account as planned. However, we must not forget that Eusebius in this work did not intend to write history, and, moreover, truly believed the historical significance of the emperor to be exactly as he described it. Accordingly, we cannot accept in this panegyric that complete condemnation of Eusebius which J. Burckhardt gives us when he calls him 'the most contrary of all writers of the panegyric,' 'the first thoroughly untruthful historian of antiquity.'

As supplements to the encomium on Constantine, Eusebius wrote three works: A speech of the emperor to the assembly of the saints (*lógos hōn égrepae to ton hagion syllócho*); the speech delivered by Eusebius on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the Emperor's reign (*triakontaeterikós*); and a discourse (*basilikós*) delivered to the emperor regarding the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Eusebius himself speaks of these works in his *Vita Constantini*.¹⁷

The authenticity of the emperor's speech to the assembly of the saints is seriously questioned. Heikel seems to have proved that in its present form it cannot be a direct translation from the Latin. On the other hand, an evident dependence on Lactantius and the employment of verses from Vergil's fourth eclogue make a Latin source quite probable, and this source may be the actual, authentic speech of the emperor himself.

Two other works, the *Triakontaeterikós* and *Basilikós*, which up to the present have always appeared in the editions

17 4.32.46.

as one work, are often cited as the *Laus Constantini*. P. Wendland was the first to discover that Chapters 1-10 of the *Laus Constantini* from the speech of *Tricennalia*, and Chapters 11-18 compose the discourse delivered on the occasion of the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

The oration of the *Tricennalia* was delivered before the emperor in the palace at Constantinople. It celebrates in powerful though somewhat bombastic language Constantine's reign of thirty years and especially his services to the Church. The *Basilikós*, on the other hand, is not an oration at all, but a treatise which aims to defend the emperor for erecting the magnificent church buildings in Jerusalem by setting forth the divinity of the Logos. An apologetic air prevails throughout. In fact, the work consists almost entirely of extracts from his *Theophany*, whose elaborate scientific arguments appear here in concise popular form.

Eusebius was primarily a scholar, a philologist in the broad sense of the term. His industry and care in the collection and employment of documentary material, and his eminent skill in the disposition of great quantities of subject matter, make him one of the greatest Christian scholars and make his works the most valuable and far-reaching in their influence upon early Christian literature. Few writers have ever shown as keen an insight in the selection of subjects which would have a lasting interest for later generations. As noted earlier, Eusebius lived in the period of transition between two great epochs which were separated from each other by such marked differences as appear only at intervals of many centuries. It remained for Eusebius to appreciate the greatness of the crisis. He alone seized the opportunity and preserved the past in all its phases—history, doctrine, criticism, and even topography—for the instruction of later generations. In this lies his chief claim to greatness.

In the presentation of his facts, as a stylist, or as a deep

and original thinker, it would be absurd to compare Eusebius with the great masters of classical antiquity. Eusebius probably did not strive to obtain stylistic excellence, although he always shows himself under the influence of rhetoric. His style is often monotonous and tires the reader with its endless periods, and when it attempts to rise to rhetorical pathos, it passes proper bounds and becomes overburdened and bombastic. He was rather the slave than the master of his vast learning. His ideas were lofty and great, but he was unequal to the task of adequately executing them. His isolated thoughts were valuable, but he could not place them together in a proper synthesis. He accumulated materials with great diligence, but he was careless and perfunctory in the use of them when accumulated. Thus, in aftertime, many succeeded him who surpassed him in their style of writing, but stood far below him in scientific sense and learning. In the growing and sensitive orthodoxy of the ages that followed Nicaea and Constantinople, suggestions of Origen and Arius were not titles to literary immortality. Yet Eusebius was tolerated, and his remains have thus come down to us almost, as it were, despite themselves, largely because of their altogether unique service to history as the witness to the ante-Nicene Church.

Although his writings are of a wide and varied character, they all have the mark of apologetic literature. In other words, his role as an apologist is not confined to his strictly apologetic works. Whatever subjects he may be treating, his thoughts seem to turn instinctively into the same mold. In dealing with the subjects of chronology, one of his main objects is to show the superior antiquity of the Hebrew oracles to the wisdom of the Greeks. When he writes ecclesiastical history, the course of events presents to him a vindication of the divine Word, in whom the faith of Christians centers. If his theme is as worldly as the encomium of a sovereign, he sees in the subject of his panegyric an

instrument used by a higher power to fulfill a divine economy. Again, if he enters on so technical a task as dividing the Gospels into sections, his real motive is to supply materials for a harmony, and thus to vindicate the essential unity of the evangelical narratives against those who denied it. His character as an apologist may be traced to two sources: the period and circumstances in which he lived and his own natural disposition. Living in the great crisis of transition, between the Hellenism of the past and the Christianity of the future, he was forced to witness their contact, both hostile and friendly. His knowledge of the wisdom of the Greeks and the teaching of the Scriptures, together with his natural breadth of sympathy and moderation of temper, fitted him, far better than anyone else of the time, for the task of treating their conflicts and associations.

In a similar way, Eusebius brings the literary-historical point of view to all his works, even the apologetic. The literary-historical point of view is wholly foreign to all other opponents of paganism and heresy. They wish only to enter upon polemical discussion, and, if they bring forward chronological facts occasionally, these facts only serve the purpose of showing their chronological inferiority. The work of Eusebius emanated from the treasures of such Christian libraries as that at Caesarea, just as profane literary-historical research also stood in closest connection with the works of librarians. Eusebius was the first to grasp clearly the concept of a Christian literature, and to employ with it the ancient methods, fixing the dates of writers and cataloguing their works. He transplanted the tradition of Alexandrian philology to Christian soil.

Eusebius' reputation after his death was varied. In the Greek Church, as long as the Arian controversy was still fresh, the tendency was to depreciate him as an orthodox father. But in proportion as the theological disputes died out,

a disposition grew up to clear him of any taint of Arian doctrine. Socrates¹⁸ goes to great length to prove Eusebius orthodox, quoting passages to substantiate his orthodoxy. Gelasius of Cyzicus is quite enthusiastic in his defense of Eusebius. He calls him 'most noble tiller of ecclesiastical husbandry,' and 'strict lover of truth,' and says that, if there is the faintest suggestion of Arianism in Eusebius' writings, it is due to his simplicity, as Eusebius himself pleaded in his self-defense. The Second Council of Nicaea, or, more exactly, the Iconoclastic controversy, marked a decided change in this attitude. Since the Iconoclasts quoted Eusebius in support of their views, the opposite party did their best to disparage him, for, if they could prove conclusively that Eusebius was an Arian, the claims of the Iconoclasts would have little foundation. This attitude toward Eusebius found expression in Photius. In fact, Eusebius' reputation never fully recovered from the injury it suffered by being involved in the Iconoclastic controversy.

In the West, Eusebius had a better fate, St. Jerome being the only person of prominence to hold a marked antipathy for him. 'The chief of the Arians,' 'the standard-bearer of the Arian faction,' 'the most flagrant champion of the impiety of Arians,' are some of the choice phrases hurled at him by the fiery Jerome. However, the great service which Eusebius had done for Christian literature prevailed with the Westerners over the attacks of St. Jerome. The two Popes, Gelasius and Pelagius II, successively shielded the reputation of Eusebius, the one by refusing to place the *Ecclesiastical History* and the *Chronicle* on the Index, and the other by expressing several noble sentiments in his defense. The offense of Eusebius, however, which in the minds of these two Popes did require an apology, was his defense of the heretic Origen. Neither Gelasius nor Pelagius once refers directly to the charge of

18 H.E. 2.21.

Arianism. Another Latin writer, anonymous, of a later period, calls Eusebius 'the key of the Scriptures and the guardian of the New Testament.' Finally, the remarkable fact of the appearance of Eusebius' name in martyrologies of both the East and West, in spite of the suspicions of heresy which hovered about his name, has always been regarded of prime importance.

A biography of Eusebius was written by Acacius, his pupil and successor in the bishopric of Caesarea, as we learn from Socrates.¹⁹ Sozomen²⁰ tells us also that Acacius was a very close friend of Eusebius and had inherited all his books and papers, and thus was in a position to give us a most complete and accurate account of his life and activity. Unfortunately, this biography has disappeared.

The only ancient evidence on the career of Eusebius comes to us as scattered notices in the works of the early Church historians (Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret), and in the writings of contemporaries and near-contemporaries such as Athanasius and Jerome. These have been collected and translated into English, and may be found in McGiffert's translation and commentary on Eusebius' *Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine*, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* I 57ff.

The best text by far and the one used as the basis for this translation is that of E. Schwartz in Volumes I-II (Leipzig 1903, 1908) of Part II of the edition of Eusebius in *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der erstern drei Jahrhunderte*, published by the then-existing Berlin Academy. This text has rendered all others obsolete, with the exception of that of Valesius (Paris 1659). Valesius added many valuable notes to his text, most of which are still indispensable;

¹⁹ *H.E.* 2.4.

²⁰ *H.E.* 3.2; 5.23.

it has been reprinted many times and appears in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* (Paris 1857).

There are various theories as to how the works of Eusebius, and the text of the *Ecclesiastical History* in particular, have come to us as they are. An excellent summary of these theories, with a full bibliography, may be found in Volume I of the Kirsopp Lake text and translation in the Loeb Classical Library, pp. xix ff.

Three important translations of the *Ecclesiastical History* have been made in English: (1) by Arthur Cushman McGiffert in *A Select Library on Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, A New Series*, Vol. I (1904); (2) by Lawlor and Oulton (London 1932); and (3) by Kirsopp Lake (Vol. I, Books 1-5, 1926) and J.E.L. Oulton (Vol. II, Books 6-10, 1932), in the Loeb Classical Library. The first of these is accompanied by an extensive and erudite commentary. No one of these translations, however, has been done from a Catholic point of view, which in the case of a writer such as Eusebius creates serious difficulties.

In the present translation, the Challoner revision of the Rheims-Douay translation of the Bible is used throughout wherever it corresponds to the Greek text of Eusebius; otherwise, the quotations are adapted with as few changes as possible to the Greek text.

SELECT CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- O. Bardenhewer, *Eusebius von Caesarea*, in *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur* III 240-262 (München 1912).
- E. Cave, *Lives of the Father* II 95-144 (Oxford 1840).
- F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Eusebius Pamphili, A Study of the Man and His Writings* (Cambridge 1933).
- H. M. Gwatkin, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, in *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History Delivered in Norwich Cathedral* (London 1896).
- V. Hely, *Eusèbe de Césarée, premier historien de l'Eglise* (Paris 1877).
- J. Kaye, *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius* (London 1888).
- H. J. Lawler, *Eusebiana. Essays on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius* (London 1888).
- J. B. Lightfoot, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, in *Dictionary of Christian Biography* II 308-318. (This article, although old, still represents the best and most exhaustive of the life and works of Eusebius.)
- E. Preuschen, *Eusebius*, in *Prot. Realencyc.* VI 1370-1439.
- C. H. Turner, 'The Early Episcopal Lists,' in *Journal of Theological Studies* (1900).
- Van Den Gheyn, *Eusèbe*, in Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible* II 2051-2056.

BOOK ONE

Chapter 1

SINCE IT IS MY PURPOSE to hand down a written account of the successions of the holy Apostles as well as of the times extending from our Saviour to ourselves; the number and nature of the events which are said to have been treated in ecclesiastical history; the number of those who were her illustrious guides and leaders in especially prominent dioceses; the number of those who in each generation by word of mouth or by writings served as ambassadors of the word of God; the names, the number, and the times of those who out of a desire for innovation launched into an extremity of error and proclaimed themselves the introducers of knowledge falsely so called,¹ mercilessly ravaging the flock of Christ like ravening wolves;² and besides this what straightway befell the entire Jewish race as the result of its plot against our Saviour; furthermore, the number, and times of the war waged by the Gentiles against the divine Word; and the character of those who on

1 Cf. 1 Tim. 6.20.

2 Cf. Acts 20.29.

various occasions have passed through the contest of blood and tortures in His behalf; and, in addition to this, the martyrdoms of our own times and with them all the gracious and kindly succor of our Saviour; [in view of all this] I shall begin with the first dispensation³ of God in our Saviour and Lord, Jesus Christ

But at this point my account asks for the indulgence of the reasonable, for I confess that it is beyond my power to fulfill the promise completely and perfectly, since we are the first to enter upon the undertaking, attempting, as it were, to travel a deserted and untrodden road,⁴ praying that we may have God as our guide and the power of the Lord as our co-worker, being unable to discover anywhere even the bare tracks of those who traveled the same path before us, except only for the brief remarks through which in one way or another they have left us partial accounts of the times in which they lived, raising their voices like torches from afar and crying out from on high as from a distant and lofty watch tower, bidding us how we must walk and keep straight the course of our story without error and danger. So, having gathered from what they have mentioned here and there such matters as we think will be useful for the subject that lies before us, and having culled appropriate passages from the ancient writers,⁵ as if, as it

3 The Greek word is *oikonomia*, which has at least four different uses among ecclesiastical writers. It is used here in its wide sense to denote the whole economy or dispensation of Christ upon earth, including the act of Incarnation.

4 Eusebius is very appropriately called the 'Father of Church History,' since he was the first to write with a comprehensive historical plan. However, as Eusebius himself says, much had been written which he could use in his history. Of his predecessors, Hegesippus and Julius Africanus approach closest to the proper conception of historical research, but they are essentially writers of memoirs.

5 Eusebius quotes freely from earlier ecclesiastical writers, but strictly according to a carefully devised plan. Furthermore, he brings in these quotations as documentary evidence. Incidentally, most of the writers quoted would otherwise be unknown, and the history of Eusebius is of inestimable value for this reason alone.

were, from intellectual meadows, we shall endeavor to consolidate them in an historical narrative, happy if we succeed in rescuing the successions, if not of all, then at least of the most renowned of the Apostles of our Saviour in those Churches which even today are accounted pre-eminent. I am of the opinion that it is most necessary for me to labor on this subject, because I am unaware that any one of the ecclesiastical⁶ writers has up to now given serious attention to this kind of writing, and I hope that it will appear very useful to those who are interested in historical research. Now, I have already composed a summary of this material in the *Chronological Canons* which I have drawn up; nevertheless, in the present work I have undertaken to make the narrative as full as possible.

My work, as I have said, will begin with the dispensation⁷ conceived in relation to Christ and the divinity ascribed to Him, loftier and greater than human conception. For, he who intends to hand down in writing the story of the Church's leadership would have to begin with the very origin of Christ's dispensation itself, more divine than it seems to most, since we have laid claim to our name from Him.

Chapter 2

Since His nature is twofold—on the one hand like the head of the body whereby He is recognized as God;¹ on the other, comparable to the feet whereby He put on man of like passions with ourselves for the sake of our own salvation—our account of subsequent events therefore would be complete

⁶ I.e., Christian.

⁷ On *oikonomia*, see n. 3, above. The *theologia* was the ascribing of divinity to Christ. Both words are semi-technical terms.

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. 11.3.

[only] if we should begin with the story of the most capital and lordly events of His entire history. In this way, furthermore, will both the genuine antiquity and the divine majesty of the Christian religion be shown to those who assume that it is recent and foreign, having put in its appearance no earlier than yesterday.² Now, no language would be sufficient for a description of the origin and the dignity and the very substance and nature of Christ, just as, indeed, the Holy Spirit says in the prophecies: 'Who shall declare his generation?'³ for no one knows the Father except the Son, nor in turn does anyone ever know the Son worthily except the Father alone who begot Him. And who except the Father could clearly conceive the Light that existed before the world and the wisdom that was intellectual and essential before the ages, the living Word who was in the beginning God by the side of the Father,⁴ the first and only offspring of God before all creation and making both visible and invisible,⁵ the commander-in-chief of the rational and immortal host of heaven,⁶ the angel of great counsel, the promoter of the ineffable plan, together with the Father the maker of all things,⁷ the second cause of the universe after the Father, the true and only-begotten Son of God, the Lord and God and King of all things begotten, who has received at once lordship and power with divinity itself and might and honor from the Father, for, according to the mystical passages of the Scriptures which deal with His divinity: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God; and the Word was God;

2 Antiquity was one of the prime requisites among the people of this age for any religion that claimed to be true. Hence, the early Christian apologists laid great stress upon the antiquity of Christianity, especially through the books of the Old Testament.

3 Isa. 53.8; Matt. 11.27.

4 Cf. John 1.9,10; Prov. 8.23.

5 Cf. John 1.2,4; Col. 1.15,16.

6 Cf. Jos. 5.14.

7 Cf. Isa. 9.6.

all things were made through him, and without him was made nothing'?⁸ This, indeed, the great Moses also teaches, as the most ancient of all Prophets, when, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, he describes the creation and arrangement of the universe, that the Creator and Maker of all things yielded to Christ Himself, and to no other than to His own clearly divine and first-born Word the making of subordinate things, and communed with Him regarding the creation of man. 'For,' he says, 'God said, "Let us make man to our image and likeness."'⁹ And another of the Prophets confirms this statement, speaking of His divine nature somewhat like this: 'He spoke, and they were made: he commanded and they were created,'¹⁰ introducing the Father and Maker as Ruler of all, commanding with a royal nod, and second to Him the divine Word, no other than He who is proclaimed by us as carrying out His Father's commands. Him, too, all who from the origin of man are said to have excelled in righteousness and in the virtue of piety, the great servant Moses and his followers and before him the first Abraham and his children and as many righteous men and Prophets as appeared thereafter, contemplated with the pure eyes of the mind and recognized, and they gave Him the worship befitting the Son of God; and He Himself, never becoming indifferent to the worship of the Father, was established as teacher of the knowledge of the Father to all men. Thus the Lord God is said to have appeared as a common man to Abraham while

⁸ John 1.1,3.

⁹ Gen. 1.26.

¹⁰ Ps. 32.9; 148.5. The purpose of this quotation is obscure because it is so brief. Eusebius is probably influenced by Ps. 32.6: 'By the word of the Lord the heavens were established; and all the power of them by the spirit of his mouth.' He takes the 'word' of this passage as Logos, and then connects the 'he' of the verse which he quotes with the Logos and not the Father. This traditional Christian interpretation undoubtedly was very familiar to Eusebius and was probably assumed by him without any consciousness of an omission of the connecting link in the argument.

seated by the oak of Mambre,¹¹ but he straightway falling down, although he saw a man with his eyes, worshiped Him as God, besought Him as Lord, and confessed that he was not ignorant who He was, using these very words: 'O Lord who judgest all the earth, wilt thou not make judgment?'¹² For, if it should be unreasonable to suppose that the unbegotten and immutable substance of God the Almighty was changed into the form of man and, in turn, that the eyes of the beholders were deceived by the phantasm of something created and that such things were falsely invented by the Scripture, who else could be proclaimed God and the Lord who judges all the earth and makes judgment, appearing in the shape of a man—if it be not proper to call Him the first cause of all things—than His pre-existent word alone?¹³ And concerning Him it was also said in the Psalms: 'He sent his word, and healed them: and delivered them from their destructions.'¹⁴ Of Him Moses very clearly speaks, calling Him a second Lord after the Father, when he says: 'The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrha brimstone and fire from the Lord.'¹⁵ Him, too, the divine Scripture calls God, when He again appeared to Jacob in the form of a man, saying to Jacob: 'Thy name shall not be called Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name, because thou hast been strong with God,' when also 'he called the name of the place "the Vision

¹¹ Cf. Gen. 18.1-3.

¹² Cf. Gen. 18.25.

¹³ Eusebius believes that the theophanies of the Old Testament were all Christophanies or appearances of Christ, the second Person of the Blessed Trinity. This was the common belief of the Christian leaders of his time. Augustine seems to have been the first of the Fathers to differ with this view. He maintained that such Christophanies were consistent with the belief in the like essence of Father and Son; furthermore, that it was not the Logos but an angel that appeared to the people of the Old Testament (Cf. *De Trinitate* 3.11). Augustine's view was widely adopted, but it has by no means supplanted the older one.

¹⁴ Ps. 106.20.

¹⁵ Gen. 19.24.

of God,"' saying: 'For I have seen God face to face, and my soul has been saved.'¹⁶ Nor is it at all proper to suppose that the theophanies described above were of subordinate angels and ministers of God, since whenever one of these appears to men the Scripture does not conceal the fact, calling them precisely by name not God nor indeed Lord, but angels, as it is easy to prove by countless references. Him, too, Josue, the successor of Moses, calls the leader of the heavenly angels and archangels and of the supernal powers and as if he were the power and wisdom of the Father,¹⁷ entrusted with the second rank of sovereignty and rule over all, 'prince of the host of the Lord,' although he saw Him only in the form and shape of a man. At any rate, it is written: 'And it came to pass, when Josue was in the field of the city of Jericho, he lifted up his eyes, and saw a man standing over against him, holding a drawn sword, and he went to him and said: "Art thou one of ours, or of our adversaries?"' 'And he said to him, "I am prince of the host of the Lord and now I am come."'¹⁸ 'And Josue fell on his face to the ground and said to him, "What commandeth my Lord to his servant?"' 'And the prince of the Lord said to Josue, "Loose thy shoe from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is a holy place."¹⁹ Here, too, you will perceive from the identity of words that this is no other than he who also spoke to Moses,¹⁹ for Scripture says with the very words and with reference to this very person: 'And when the Lord saw that he went forward to see, the Lord called to him out of the midst of the bush, and

16 Cf. Gen. 32.28,30. The allusion here in verse 30 is to the text of the Septuagint.

17 Cf. 1 Cor. 1.24.

18 Cf. Jos. 5.13-15.

19 Eusebius, as did Justin Martyr, Origen, Cyprian, and other early Fathers, identifies the one who appeared to Josue with him who had appeared to Moses, since the same words were used in both instances. Many of the later Fathers, such as Theodoret, regarded him who appeared to Josue as the Archangel Michael, described in Daniel 10.21 and 21.1 as fighting for God's people.

said, Moses, Moses. And he said, What is it? And he said, Come not nigh thither, put off the shoe from thy feet: for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. And he said to him, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.²⁰

And that there really is a certain substance living and subsisting before the world, who ministered to the Father and God of the universe for the making of all created things called the Word and Wisdom of God, can be learned not only by the preceding proofs but from the very person of Wisdom herself, who through Solomon somewhat thus reveals the mysteries concerning herself: 'I wisdom dwell in counsel, and am present in learned thoughts. By me kings reign, and the mighty decree justice; by me great men are magnified, and princes rule the earth by me.'²¹ And to this she adds: 'The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways for his works; before the world he set me up; in the beginning before making the earth, before the fountain of waters sprang out, before the mountains had been established, and before all the hills he brought me forth. When he prepared the heavens, I was present with him, and when he made safe the fountains under the heavens, I was with him disposing them. I was she in whom he was delighted every day, and I was delighted before him at all times, when he rejoiced that he had completed the world.'²² So, let this be our proof in brief that the divine Word pre-existed and appeared to some, if not to all, men.

Now, why this announcement was not made long before to all men and to all nations, as it is now, would appear evident from the following.²³ The life of men in the past was

20 Cf. Exod. 3.4-6. See also Justin's *Dial.* 63.

21 Cf. Prov. 8.12,15,16

22 Cf. Prov. 8.22-25,27,28,30,31.

23 Eusebius undertakes to answer an objection here which was old and very general. See the beginning of Gregory of Nyssa's *Third*

not yet able to receive the all-wise and all-virtuous teaching of Christ. Immediately in the beginning, after the first life in blessedness, the first man, despising God's command, fell into this mortal and perishable life and exchanged his former life of luxury with God for this curse-laden earth; and those who populated this entire world of ours after him were manifestly much worse, with the exception of one here and there, and chose a brutish manner of living and an intolerable life. They gave no thought to city or state, to the arts or sciences, and, besides, were unacquainted even with the name of laws and ordinances, virtue and philosophy; like nomads in a desert, they lived like savage and cruel creatures, destroying natural reason and the germs of thought and civilization in man's soul by the excess of their self-chosen wickedness, giving themselves over entirely to all manner of iniquity, so as at one time to corrupt one another, at another to kill one another, and again to eat human flesh, to venture on battles with God and on battles with giants celebrated among all men, even to plan to fortify the earth against heaven, and by the madness of a perverted mind to prepare war against the supreme God Himself.²⁴ While they were leading this manner of life, God, the Guardian of all, pursued them with floods and conflagrations, as if they had been a wild forest spread over the whole earth, and with successive famines and plagues and wars in turn and with thunderbolts from on high He cut them down, as if checking some terrible and quite obstinate disease of their souls with more severe punishments. Then, when the stupor of wickedness, as of a terrible intoxication, was spread widely over almost everyone, over-

Oration on the Birth of the Lord, also Justin Martyr and Origen in his work against Celsus, as examples. Eusebius himself follows the same argument in his *Dem. evang.*, Proem. VIII.

- 24 The reference here seems to be to Gen. 11.1-9, the building of the tower of Babel. However, he brings in instances familiar to his readers whether drawn from Christian or pagan sources. Cf. *Praep. evang.* 9.14.

shadowing and beclouding the souls of nearly all, the first-born²⁵ and first-created wisdom of God, namely, the pre-existent Word himself, because of His exceeding love of man, appeared to His subjects now in visions of angels, now also to one or two of the ancients beloved of God in person, as a saving power of God,²⁶ in no other than human form, for in no other way was it possible for them [to perceive Him].

When the seeds of true religion now had been cast by them upon a multitude of men, and a whole nation of Hebraic origin existed on earth persevering in true religion, He handed down to them through the Prophet Moses, as to multitudes still corrupted by their ancient ways, images and symbols of a certain mystical sabbath and of circumcision and instructions in other spiritual principles, but not unveiled initiations into the mysteries themselves. But when their law became celebrated and like a fragrant breeze was spread among all men, then, indeed, under their influence the minds of most of the Gentiles were softened by the law-givers and philosophers everywhere, and their wild and savage brutality was so changed to mildness that they possessed deep peace, friendships, and social intercourse.²⁷ Even at that time, at the beginning of the Roman Empire, there appeared again to all men and to the Gentiles throughout the world, as if previously assisted and now actually ready for the reception of the knowledge of the Father, that same teacher of the virtues, the assistant of the Father in all good things, the

25 Cf. Col. 1.25; Prov. 8.22; John 1.1.

26 Cf. 1 Cor. 1.24.

27 Eusebius and most of the Fathers believed that the Greek philosophers, law-givers, and poets had drawn upon the ancient Hebrews for their wisdom. This they believed especially with reference to Plato and Pythagoras, who were believed to have become acquainted with the literature of the Hebrews on their journey to Egypt. The Christian apologists regularly made a great deal of this in their efforts to prove the antiquity of Christianity. For example, compare Justin's *Apol.* 1.59f.; Clement of Alexandria's *Cohort. ad Gentes* 6; and Tertullian's *Apol.* 47; also Eusebius' *Praep. evang.* Books 9-10.

divine and heavenly Word of God, in a human body in no way differing in substance from our own nature. And He performed and suffered such things as were in accord with the prophecies which foretold that One who was both man and God would come to dwell in the world, as the performer of miraculous deeds, and that He would be made manifest to all the Gentiles as the teacher of the worship of the Father, and that the marvel of His birth and His new teaching and the wonder of His deeds, and, in addition to these, the manner of His death and resurrection from the dead, and, above all, His divine ascension into heaven would also be made manifest. Thus Daniel the Prophet, under the influence of the divine Spirit, saw His kingdom in the end and was inspired thus to describe the vision of God in human fashion: 'For I beheld,' he says, 'till thrones were placed, and the Ancient of days sat: his garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like clean wool: his throne like flames of fire: the wheels of it like a burning fire. A swift stream of fire issued forth from before him: thousands of thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times a hundred thousand stood before him: the judgment sat, and the books were opened.'²⁸ And next he says: 'I beheld, and lo, one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and he came even to the Ancient of days: and he was presented before him. And to him was given power, and glory, and a kingdom, and all peoples, tribes, and tongues shall serve him. His power is an everlasting power that shall not pass away: and his kingdom shall not be destroyed.'²⁹ These words clearly could apply to none other than to our Saviour, the God-Word, who in the beginning was with God,³⁰ called 'son of man' because of His final Incarnation. But, since we have collected in special com-

²⁸ Dan. 7.9,10.

²⁹ Cf. Dan. 7.13,14.

³⁰ Cf. John 1.1.

mentaries³¹ the prophetic utterances regarding our Saviour Jesus Christ, and in others have given a fuller demonstration of what is revealed concerning Him, we shall be satisfied for the present with what has been said [thus far].

Chapter 3

It is now time to show that the very name of Jesus, and especially that of Christ had already been honored by the ancient God-loving Prophets.¹ Moses himself, having been the first to make known the name of Christ as being especially revered and glorious, having handed down the types and symbols of heavenly things and the mysterious images according to the oracle which said to him: 'See that thou make all things according to the pattern which was shown thee on the mount,'² and having consecrated a man High Priest of God, in so far as it was at all possible, calls this man Christ;³ that is, to this dignity of the High Priesthood which with him surpassed all pre-eminence among men, for additional honor and glory he attaches the name of Christ. Thus, then, he indeed knew Christ as a Being divine. And the same [Moses] by divine inspiration foresaw the name Jesus very clearly, and again also endowed this with special privilege. The name of Jesus, which had never been uttered among men before it was made known to Moses, Moses applied first to this One alone,⁴ who, he knew, again as a type and a symbol, would receive the rule over all after his

³¹ Eusebius may be referring here to either or both of the following works: *Prophetical Extracts* and *Dem. evang.*

¹ Cf. *Dem. evang.* 4.17.

² Heb. 8.5; cf. Exod. 25.40.

³ Cf. Lev. 4.5,16; 6.22.

⁴ Cf. Num. 13.17.

death. His successor, at any rate, who had never before used the title 'Jesus,' but had been called by another name, 'Auses,' which his parents had bestowed upon him, he himself proclaims Jesus, as a privilege of honor far greater than a royal crown, giving him the name because Jesus, the son of Nave,⁵ himself bore a resemblance to our Saviour, who alone, after Moses and the completion of the symbolic⁶ worship transmitted by him, received the rule of the true and pure religion. And in this way Moses bestowed the name of our Saviour Jesus Christ, as a mark of the greatest honor, upon the two men who in his time surpassed all the rest of the people in virtue and glory—the high priest and him who would rule after him. And the Prophets of succeeding times also clearly foretold Christ by name, giving testimony beforehand both to the intrigue of the people of the Jews which was destined to arise against Him and to the calling of the Gentiles through Him. At one time, Jeremias bears testimony in words somewhat as follows: 'The breath of our mouth, Christ the Lord, is taken in their sins, to whom we said: Under his shadow we shall live among the Gentiles.'⁷ At another time, David speaks in perplexity thus: 'Why have the Gentiles raged, and the people devised vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes met together, against the Lord, and against his Christ,'⁸ to which he later adds in the person of Christ Himself: 'The Lord hath said to me: Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession.'⁹ Now, the

5 In Num. 13.17 (Sept.), the changing of Hoshea, son of Nun, to Josue, is related; the name Hoshea is spelled Auses; Josue is Jesus, and Nun is spelled Nave.

6 The implication is that the Jewish worship symbolized the future Christianity.

7 Cf. Lam. 4.20.

8 Ps. 2.1,2.

9 Ps. 2.7,8.

name of Christ adorned not only those among the Hebrews who were honored with the prepared oil as a symbol, but also the kings whom the Prophets at the bidding of God anointed and, as it were, constituted typical Christs, since they also bore in themselves the types of the royal and sovereign power of the only and true Christ, the divine Word who ruleth over all. We have also learned through tradition that some of the Prophets themselves had already through anointing become Christs in type, so that all these have reference to the true Christ, the divine and heavenly Word, who really is the only High Priest of all, the only King of all creation, and the Father's only Archprophet of the Prophets. And the proof of this is that no one of those symbolically anointed of old, either of priests or of kings or indeed of Prophets, possessed so great a power of divine virtue as was displayed by our Saviour and Lord Jesus, the only true Christ. No one of them, indeed, although they were renowned for dignity and honor among their own peoples for very many generations, ever called their subjects Christians from the symbolical application of the name of Christ to themselves. Moreover, no one of them received the honor of veneration from their subjects, nor after death was there any such disposition among their subjects as to be ready to die in behalf of him who was honored. And never throughout the world of nations did so great a commotion arise over any person of that day, since the power of the symbol was unable to create such an effect among them as the presence of reality which was exhibited by our Saviour. For He received the symbol and types of the High Priesthood from no one, and He did not derive His earthly origin from a race of priests, and He was not elevated to a kingdom by armed forces of men, and He was not a prophet like those of old, and He obtained no honor nor any pre-eminence among the Jews, yet with all, even if without symbols but with the truth itself,

He was adorned. Though He did not then obtain honors like those which we have mentioned above, yet He was called Christ more than any of them, and as the only true Christ of God Himself He filled the whole world with Christians, His truly reverend and holy name, handing down to them no longer types or images but the uncovered virtues themselves and the heavenly life in the very doctrines of truth, and He has received the chrism, not that prepared with material substances but the very divine anointing itself with the spirit of God, by sharing in the unbegotten divinity of the Father. And Isaias again teaches this very truth, exclaiming in one place as if from Christ Himself: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me. Wherefore he hath anointed me; to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me, to announce deliverance to captives and sight to the blind.'¹⁰ And not only Isaias, but also David, proclaims to His Person, saying: 'Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a sceptre of uprightness. Thou hast loved justice, and hated iniquity: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.'¹¹ In these passages the text calls Him God in the first verse, and in the second honors Him with a royal sceptre; then, in turn, going on, after royal and divine power, represents Him in the third place as having become Christ, anointed not with oil of material substances but with the divine 'oil of gladness.' In this way, moreover, it points out His special distinction and great superiority over and difference from those of old who as types¹² were anointed more materially. Elsewhere, the same David makes his statements about Him, speaking clearly somewhat as follows: 'The Lord said to my Lord: Sit thou at my right hand: Until I

¹⁰ Cf. Luke 4.18,19; also, Isa. 61.1 (Sept.).

¹¹ Ps. 44.7,8.

¹² According to Eusebius, this is the meaning of 'above thy fellows' quoted above.

make thy enemies the footstool of thy feet,¹³ and 'From the womb before the day star I begot thee. The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent: Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedek.'¹⁴ Melchisedek is introduced in the Holy Scriptures of the most high God,¹⁵ not consecrated by any materially prepared oil, and not even as belonging by racial descent to the priesthood of the Hebrews. Thus, according to His order and not that of others who received symbols and types, our Saviour has been called Christ and priest with an appeal to an oath. Thus, also, the narrative does not tell us that He was anointed corporeally by the Jews or that He was of a tribe that held the priesthood, but that He came into being from God himself before the day star, that is, before the establishment of the world, and that He possesses an immortal and ageless priesthood to boundless eternity. A great and clear proof of the immaterial¹⁶ and divine anointing that took place upon Him is that He alone of all those who have ever existed up to this time is called Christ by all men throughout the whole world, and is confessed and borne witness to under this name by all, and is so commemorated by Greeks and barbarians and up to this day is honored as a king by His worshipers throughout the world, and is admired as more than a Prophet, and is glorified as the only and true High Priest of God, and, above all this, as the pre-existent Word of God,¹⁷ who came into being before all ages and received the honor of worship from the Father, is worshiped as God. Yet, most wonderful of all, we who have consecrated ourselves to Him honor Him not only with our voices and

13 Cf. Ps. 109.1.

14 Ps. 109.3,4; cf. Heb. 7.11-25.

15 Cf. Ps. 45.6,7; Heb. 5.6,10; 6.20,8.

16 The Greek *asómatos* is a technical term meaning 'immaterial.' As such, it has a long history. It was popularized in Christian metaphysics especially by Origen.

17 Cf. *Dem. evang.* 4.15. Eusebius is the first of the Fathers to speak of the three offices of Christ.

with the sound of words but also with the entire disposition of our soul, so as to prefer giving testimony to Him rather than saving our own lives.

Chapter 4

Let these remarks suffice at this point as a necessary preface to my history, that no one may regard our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, as one recently come into being because of the time of His ministry in the flesh. But, that no one may suppose His teaching to be new and strange as if composed by a youth and one differing in no respect from the rest of men, come, let us also discuss this point briefly. For, when the presence of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, recently shone forth upon all men, an admittedly new nation appeared in such numbers in accord with the inscrutable prophecies of the time, not small and not weak and not dwelling somewhere in a corner of the earth, but the most populous of all the nations and the most pious,¹ indestructible and unconquerable in that it always obtains help from God, the nation that has been honored by all with the name of Christ. When one of the Prophets foresaw with the eye of the Divine Spirit what this nation was destined to be he was so amazed as to exclaim: 'Who hath ever heard such a thing? and who hath spoken thus? hath the earth brought forth in one day? and hath a nation been brought forth at once?'² And the same Prophet also indicates in a manner its future name, when he says: 'And a new name shall be applied to those who serve me, which shall be blessed on the earth.'³ But, even if we are clearly new and this truly recent name of Christians

1 Cf. *Apol.* 37.

2 Isa. 66.8.

3 Cf. Isa. 65.15,16.

has lately been known among all nations, our life and manner of conduct in accordance with the very teachings of our religion have not been recently fashioned by us, but, as it were, from the first creation of man have been established by the natural concepts of the God-favored men of old, as we shall somehow show as follows. The nation of Hebrews is really not new, but a nation held in high esteem for its antiquity by all men, and is itself known to all. Now, stories and writings among this nation include ancient men, to be sure rare and few in number, yet distinguished for piety and righteousness and every other virtue, some remarkable before the flood, others after it; of the children and descendants of Noe, for example, Abraham, whom the children of the Hebrews proudly proclaim as their own founder and progenitor. If anyone should tell us, going back from Abraham to the first man, that all those who have had the testimony of righteousness were Christians in fact if not in name, he would strike not far from the truth.⁴ For, as the name professes to show, that the Christian man through the knowledge of Christ and His teachings excels in sobriety and righteousness and patience of life and manliness of virtue and in the pious confession of the one and only God over all, all this was zealously practiced by them no less than by us. They did not care about bodily circumcision, as we do not; nor about the observance of Sabbaths, as we do not; nor about the avoidness of certain foods nor about making a distinction in the others, such as Moses, first of all, in the beginning handed down to his successors to be observed as symbols, just as such things are of no concern to Christians today. But they clearly knew Him, the Christ of God, since it has already been shown that He was seen by Abraham, deliberated with Isaac, spoke to Israel, and conversed with Moses and the Prophets thereafter. Hence you would find that those God-

4 Cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 1.146.

favored men were deemed worthy even of the name of Christ according to the words which say regarding them: 'Touch ye not my anointed [Christs]: and do no evil to my prophets.'⁵ Hence it is clear that the religion which was recently proclaimed to all the Gentiles through the teaching of Christ must be considered the first and most ancient of all and the oldest discovery of religion by those God-favored men of the age of Abraham. If now it is said that Abraham received the command of circumcision much later, nevertheless he is said to have received before this command the testimony of justice through faith, as the divine Scripture so says somewhere: 'Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice.'⁶ And to Abraham, as he was before circumcision, a prophecy was given by God, who revealed Himself to him (and this was Christ Himself, the Word of God) regarding those who in later times were to be justified in a manner similar to himself, in these very words: 'And in thee shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed,'⁷ and 'He shall become a great and mighty nation, and in him all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.'⁸ We may also believe this as having been fulfilled in us. For he was justified by faith in the Word of God, the Christ, who was revealed to him, after he had renounced the superstitions of his fathers⁹ and the former errors of his life, and had confessed the God, who is over all, as one and had served this God by deeds of virtue and not by worship of the law of Moses which was later, and to him, as he was then, it was said that all the tribes and all the nations of the earth will be blessed in him; and by deeds more manifest than words is that manner of religion of Abraham shown to be practiced at present among Christians alone

5 Cf. Ps. 104.15; also, *Chron.* 16.22 and Ps. 105.15.

6 Gen. 15.6; cf. also, Rom. 4.3.

7 Gen. 12.3.

8 Gen 18.18.

9 Cf. Gen. 12.1.

throughout the whole earth. What, then, would prevent us, who are of Christ, from confessing that our manner of life and religion and that of the God-beloved men of old is one and the same? So we demonstrate that the correct practice of religion which was handed down to us by the teaching of Christ is not new and strange, but, if we must speak truthfully, is the very first and the only true religion. Let this discussion suffice for the subject.

Chapter 5

Now, then, after the necessary introduction to our proposed history of the Church, it remains for us to continue on our course as if upon a journey, from the appearance of our Saviour in the flesh, after invoking God, the Father of the Word, and Jesus Christ Himself, our revealed Saviour and Lord, the heavenly Word of God to assist us and to co-operate in the attaining of truth in our narrative. It was the forty-second year of the reign of Augustus,¹ and the twenty-eighth after the subjection of Egypt and the death of Antony and Cleopatra, with the latter of whom the dynasty of the Ptolemies in Egypt came to an end, when our Saviour and Lord, Jesus Christ,² at the time of the first census, while Cyrenius³ was Governor of Syria, in accord with the

¹ Eusebius makes the reign of Augustus begin with the death of Julius Caesar, i.e., 1 B.C., and thus the next year becomes the *annus Domini*. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1, who gives the twenty-eighth year after the conquest of Egypt as the year of Christ's birth, agrees with this, as does also Epiphanius, *Haer.* 51.22, and Orosius, *Hist.* 1.1. But Irenaeus 3.25, and Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.* 8, give as the year of the nativity the forty-first year of Augustus, 751 U.C., i.e., 3 B.C. Neither of these dates agrees with Matt. 2.1: 'When Jesus therefore was born in Bethlehem of Juda, in the days of king Herod,' since Herod died in 4 B.C. The exact year has always been a matter of dispute.

² Cf. Luke 2.2.

³ The original Latin form of the name is Guirinius. Luke uses the Greek form, Cyrenius, which Eusebius also uses.

prophecies⁴ concerning Him, was born in Bethlehem of Judaea. Flavius Josephus, the most famous of the historians among the Hebrews, also makes mention of this census in the time of Cyrenius,⁵ adding another account about the sect of Galileans which arose at about the same time, of which Luke, among our writers, has made mention in the Acts, saying: 'After him rose up Judas the Galilean in the days of the census and drew some people after him; he too perished, and all his followers were scattered abroad.'⁶ The writer mentioned above in agreement with this provides the following by way of explanation in Book 18 of his *Antiquities*: 'And Cyrenius, one of those summoned to the Senate, a man who had held other offices and had passed through all to become consul, and a person of great dignity in other respects, came to Syria with a small force, having been sent by Caesar with judicial power over the people and to make an evaluation of their property.'⁷ And a little later he says: 'But Judas, a Gaulonite, of a city by the name of Gamala, taking Sadduchus, a Pharisee, with him, instigated a revolt, saying that the valuation led to nothing else than downright slavery, and calling upon the people to defend their liberty.'⁸ And in Book 2 of the *History of the Jewish War* he writes as follows about the same man: 'At this time a certain Galilean, Judas by name, incited the inhabitants to revolt, calling them cowards, if they submitted to the payment of tribute to the

4 Cf. Mich. 5.2.

5 Eusebius assumes that the census mentioned by Josephus in *Ant.* 18.11 and referred to in Acts 5.27 is identical with that mentioned in Luke 2.2. This is an obvious error, as a period of ten years separated the two. Any attempt to reconcile the two is of no avail, and to charge Eusebius with willful deception and perversion of the facts, as some have done, is quite unjustified. The worst that can be said here of Eusebius is that he is guilty of an inexcusable piece of carelessness. See Eusebius, *Ecl. proph.* 158ff.

6 Acts 5.37.

7 Josephus *A.J.* 18.1.

8 *Ibid.* 18.4.

Romans, and if they endured, besides God, mortal masters.⁹
So much for Josephus.

Chapter 6

Now, at that time, when Herod¹ was the first person of foreign origin to hold rule over the Jewish nation, the prophecy made through Moses that 'A ruler shall not fail from Juda, nor a leader from his thigh till he come for whom it is reserved,'² began to be fulfilled, and this one Moses also shows was to be the 'expectation of nations.'³ The terms of the prediction were indeed unfulfilled so long as it was possible for them to live under the native rulers of the nation, beginning with Moses himself and continuing to the reign of Augustus, in whose time Herod, the first foreigner, was entrusted by the Romans with the government of the Jews, he being, as Josephus hands down,⁴ an Idumaean⁵ on his father's side and an Arabian on his mother's; but according to Africanus,⁶—and he, too, was no ordinary writer—those who

9 Josephus, *B.I.* 2.118.

1 Herod the Great, Son of Antipater, an Idumean. He had been appointed procurator of Judaea by Caesar in 47 B.C., and at the same time was made Governor of Galilee. He was declared King of Judaea by the Roman Senate in 40 B.C.

2 Cf. Gen. 49.10.

3 *Ibid.*

4 Cf. Josephus, *A.I.* 14.8,121; *B.I.* 1.123,181. According to Josephus, Herod's father was Antipater, and his mother Cypros, an Arabian woman of noble birth.

5 Also called Edomites, descendants of Esau and inhabitants of the Sinaitic peninsula south of the Dead Sea. The principal city of these people was Petra, the famous rock city. Always the enemies of the Jews, they refused them free passage through their land (Cf. Num. 20.20). They were conquered by Saul and David, regained their independence and were finally subjugated by John Hyrcanus. Although he permitted them to retain the possession of their land, he forced them to undergo circumcision and adopt the Jewish law. Cf. Josephus, *A.I.* 14.8,121; *B.I.* 1.123,181.

6 On Africanus, cf. Book 6, Ch. 31.

are accurately informed about his history say that Antipater, who was his father, was the son of a certain Herod of Ascalon,⁷ one of the so-called temple servants⁸ at the Temple of Apollo. This Antipater, after being captured as a child by Idumaeen robbers, remained with them, because his father, who was a poor man, was unable to pay ransom for him; after being brought up in their customs, he was later on befriended by Hyrcanus,⁹ the high priest of the Jews. His child was the Herod¹⁰ of the time of our Saviour. When, then, the kingdom of the Jews came upon such a man, the expectation of the Gentiles in accordance with the prophecy was now at the door, since those who had ruled and governed among them in succession after Moses ceased with him.¹¹ Before their captivity and removal to Babylon they were ruled by kings, beginning first with Saul and David; and before the kings, rulers called judges, who came after Moses and his successor Josue administered them. After the return from Babylon they continued without interruption to employ an aristocratic form of government with an oligarchy (for the priests had the direction of affairs), until Pompey, a general of the Romans, attacked and took Jerusalem by force, and defiled the holy places by entering the innermost sanctuary of the Temple.¹² And him who was both king and

7 Ascalon, one of the five cities of the Philistines, frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, on the Mediterranean Sea between Gaza and Joppa. Nothing is known of this Herod of Ascalon; he may never have existed.

8 *Hieródouloi*; literally, *temple-slaves*, whose duties were numerous.

9 Hyrcanus II, eldest son of the King Alexander Jannaeus of the Maccalaeen family. He became high priest on the death of his father in 78 B.C., and on the death of his mother in 69 B.C. ascended the throne. At the command of Herod the Great he was murdered. He was always a weak man, and during his reign was entirely under the influence of his minister, Antipater.

10 Herod the Great.

11 Josephus, *A.J.* 11.112, 111.

12 Pompey, in 63 B.C., could not resist the temptation of entering the Holy of Holies. He was very much impressed by its simplicity, and failed to disturb its treasures, wondering at a religion without a visible God.

high priest, by name Aristobulus,¹³ and who had continued the succession of his ancestors until that time, he sent as a prisoner together with his children to Rome; and to Hyrcanus his brother he handed over the high-priesthood, and the entire nation of the Jews he made tributary to the Romans from that time.¹⁴ Immediately after Hyrcanus, who was the last in line of the priestly succession, was made prisoner by the Parthians,¹⁵ Herod the first foreigner, as I have said, was entrusted with the nation of the Jews by the Roman Senate and the Emperor Augustus, and in his time clearly, when the advent of Christ was close at hand, the expected salvation and calling of the Gentiles also followed according to the prophecy.¹⁶ Now, from this time, when the rulers and governors from Juda, I mean those of the nation of the Jews, had ceased, naturally the affairs of the priesthood which had passed on steadily from generation to generation in closest succession became straightway confused. Of this, too, you have as a trustworthy witness, Josephus,¹⁷ who points out that Herod, on being entrusted with the kingdom by the Romans, no longer appointed as high priest those from the ancient line, but assigned the honor to obscure persons, and that a course similar to that of Herod's in the appointment

13 Aristobulus II, younger brother of Hyrcanus, and much more able and energetic. He took over the kingdom by arrangement with his brother in 66 B.C. Pompey deposed him in 63 and took him to Rome. He died in 48 B.C. He had assumed the power by reason of his superior ability, not by regular succession as Eusebius says.

14 The Jews were independent for three years, from 40 to 37 B.C., when Antigonus, son of Aristobulus and nephew of Hyrcanus, was in power. Otherwise, the independence of the Jews ceased from then until modern times.

15 In 40 B.C. Antigonus, with the help of the Parthians, seized Jerusalem and set himself up there as king. But Herod conquered him in 37 B.C. Hyrcanus returned to Rome in 36, but not as high priest.

16. Cf. Isa. 9.2; 42.6; 49.6; etc.

17 Cf. *A.I.* 20.247,249.

of the priests was followed by Archelaus,¹⁸ his son, and after him by the Romans¹⁹ when they took over the government of the Jews. The same writer points out that Herod was the first to lock up the sacred robe of the high priest and to keep it under his own seal, for he no longer permitted the high priests to keep it at their disposal, and that Archelaus after him and after the latter the Romans did likewise. Let so much be said, also, as a proof of the fulfillment of another prophecy on the manifestation of our Saviour Jesus Christ. The text in Daniel,²⁰ after describing very clearly a number of certain weeks precisely 'unto Christ the prince,' which we have described elsewhere,²¹ prophesies that after the conclusion of these weeks the anointing among the Jews would be utterly destroyed; and this is clearly proved to have been fulfilled at the time of the birth of our Saviour Jesus Christ. Let so much be by way of a necessary premise on our part to establish the truth of the date.

Chapter 7

Since Matthew and Luke in their Gospels have handed down to us the genealogy of Christ differently and are thought by many to disagree, and since each one of the faithful in his ignorance of the truth has been eager to make guesses about the passages, come, let us set forth the story that has come

18 A son of Herod the Great by Malthace, a Samaritan woman; younger brother of Herod Antipas. On the death of Herod in 4 B.C., he succeeded to the government of Idumea, Samaria, and Judaea, under the title of ethnarch.

19 Archelaus died in A.D. 7. Judaea was then made a Roman province, and was ruled by procurators until Herod Agrippa I came into power in 37.

20 Dan. 9.24-27.

21 Cf. *Dem. evang.* 8.2-3; also *Eclogae proph.* 3.45.

down to us about them, which the Africanus indicated by us a little above told when writing a letter to Aristides¹ on the harmony in the genealogies in the Gospels, completely refuting the opinions of others as forced and falsified, and setting forth the story which he himself had received² in these very words: 'Since the names of the families in Israel were numbered either by nature or by law; by nature, through the succession of legitimate birth; by law, when another begat children in the name of a brother who had died childless;³ for because clear hope of resurrection had as yet not been given, they portrayed the future promise by a mortal resurrection, in order that the name of him who had departed might continue without end. Since, then, by being inserted into this kind of genealogy some succeeded legitimately in the order of father and son, but others, though born to one father, were ascribed to another by name, mention was made of both, of the actual forebears and of those only so by name. Thus, neither of the Gospels makes a false statement, reckoning both nature and law. For the two families were so intermingled, the one descended from Solomon and the other from Nathan,⁴ by the raising up of children by the childless and by second marriages and by the raising up of seed, that the same persons might be justly regarded as belonging to certain parents at one time and to others at another, namely, to their reputed and to their real fathers. Thus, both accounts are strictly true and come down to Joseph complicatedly but accurately. That my words may be clear, I shall explain the

1 Nothing is known about this Aristides, but the epistle itself exists in numerous fragments and is translated in the series of *Ante-Nicene Father*. Africanus appears to have been the first to attempt to harmonize the two genealogies of Christ systematically.

2 Eusebius errs in saying that Africanus received the following explanation from tradition, for Africanus himself states expressly that his interpretation is not supported by tradition.

3 For the law, see Deut. 25.5ff.

4 Son of David and Bathsheba, and thus own brother of Solomon.

intermingling of the families.⁵ By counting the generations from David through Solomon, the third from the end is found to be Matthan,⁶ who begat Jacob the father of Joseph, but from Nathan the son of David, according to Luke,⁷ in similar fashion the third from the end is Melchi, for Joseph was the son of Eli, the son of Melchi. Therefore, since Joseph is our subject, we must show how each is recorded as his father, Jacob deriving his descent from Solomon and Eli from Nathan, and how first these, that is, Jacob and Eli, were two brothers, and how before them their fathers, Matthan and Melchi, who were of different families, are declared to be Joseph's grandfathers. Now, Matthan and Melchi, having married the same woman successively, became fathers of step-brothers, for the law did not prevent a woman who had lost her husband by divorce or by death from marrying another. By Estha, then, for the woman was so called according to tradition, first Matthan, who traced his family from Solomon, begat Jacob, and, on the death of Matthan, Melchi, who by descent goes back to Nathan, being of the same tribe but of another family, as I have said above, married the widow and had a son, Eli. So, we shall find Jacob and Eli, step-brothers, of two different families, of whom one, Jacob, when Eli his brother died childless, took over the wife and by her begat

5 This involved argument seems to say that among the Jews, when a man died childless, his brother was bound by the duty of begetting children by the widow, who continued to be regarded as the wife of the deceased. These children then were regarded as the offspring of the dead brother, although actually those of the living brother. So it was with Joseph. Legally, he was the son of Eli; physically, the son of Jacob. In this case, an additional complication arose from the fact that Eli and Jacob were only half-brothers; they were both the sons of Estha, but Eli was by her second husband, Melchi, descended from Nathan the son of David, and Jacob by her first husband, Matthan, descended from Solomon the Son of David. So, when Matthew gives the physical descent of Jesus, he traces it through Jacob to Solomon, while Luke, avoiding the word 'begat,' gives the legal descent by tracing it through Eli to Nathan.

6 Cf. Matt. 1.15,16.

7 Cf. Luke 3.23,24.

a third (from Estha), Joseph, according to nature for himself (and according to reason), because of which it is written, "And Jacob begot Joseph,"⁸ but according to law he was the son of Eli, for Jacob, being his brother, raised up seed to him. Wherefore, the genealogy traced also according to him will not be rendered void, which Matthew the Evangelist enumerates in these words: "And Jacob begot Joseph," but Luke, on the other hand, says: "Who was, as was supposed [for he also adds this], the son of Joseph, the son of Heli, the son of Melchi,"⁹ for he could not express the legal descent more distinctly, and up to the end he suppressed the expression "he begot" with reference to such raising of children, when he referred back to "Adam, who was the son of God,"¹⁰ analytically. This, indeed, is neither without proof nor is it a conjecture. In any case, the relatives of the Saviour according to the flesh, either from a desire to boast or simply giving information, but at all events telling the truth, have handed down the following account. When Idumaeans robbers attacked Ascalon, a city of Palestine, they carried away captive from a temple of Apollo, which had been built near the walls, Antipater—son of a certain temple slave, Herod—in addition to other booty, and because the priest was unable to pay ransom for his son, Antipater was reared in the customs of the Idumaeans and later won the favor of Hyrcanus the high priest of Judaea. When he went on a mission to Pompey in behalf of Hyrcanus and freed his kingdom for him, which was stolen away by his brother Aristobulus, he himself had the good fortune to obtain the title of overseer of Palestine.¹¹ When Antipater was treacherously murdered out of envy for his great good fortune,¹² he

8 Matt. 1.16.

9 Cf. Luke 3.23,24.

10 Luke 3.28.

11 Appointed by Julius Caesar in 47 B.C.

12 Poisoned by Malichus in 42 B.C.

was succeeded by a son Herod,¹³ who later was appointed by Antony and with a decree of the august Senate to be King of the Jews.¹⁴ His sons were Herod¹⁵ and other tetrarchs. These statements, moreover, agree also with the histories of the Greeks.¹⁶ But, since until then the genealogies of the Hebrews and those traceable to proselytes, such as Achior¹⁷ the Ammonite and Ruth the Moabite,¹⁸ and those mixed genealogies that had come out of Egypt, had been inscribed in the archives,¹⁹ Herod, because the genealogy of the Israelites contributed nothing to his advantage, and because he was goaded by the consciousness of his low birth, burned all the records of their genealogies,²⁰ thinking that he would appear of noble origin by reason of the fact that no one could from public documents trace back his genealogy to the patriarchs or proselytes and those mingled with them, the so-called "gers."²¹ Now, a few of those who were careful, having private records of their own, either by remembering the names or possessing them otherwise from copies, prided themselves on preserving the memory of their high birth, and among

13 Herod the Great.

14 Appointed king in 40 B.C.

15 The tetrarchs Herod Antipas and Herod Philip II, and the ethnarch Archelaus.

16 Cf. Cassius Dio 37.15ff. and Stroba 16.2.46.

17 A general of the Ammonites in the army of Holofernes. According to the Book of Judith, he was a general of the army of Nebuchadnezzar, King of the Assyrians, and was slain by Judith. Achior is said to have become a Jewish proselyte later.

18 Cf. Judith 14.10; Exod. 12.38; Deut. 23.8.

19 The Jews, who made so much of tribal and family descent, were accustomed to keep copies of the genealogical records of the people in the public archives. Cf. *Contra Apion.* 1.7.

20 There is reason to doubt the truth of Africanus' statement of the burning of the records. Thus we learn from Josephus, *De vita* 1, that he himself withdrew his own lineage from the public records, which must have taken place at least a half-century later than the time Herod is said to have destroyed them utterly. Furthermore, there is no other witness to the statement besides Africanus.

21 A Hellenized form of the Hebrew word which is translated 'stranger.' Cf. Exod. 12.19: 'whether he be a stranger or born in the land.' Africanus is referring here to all who came out of Egypt with the Israelites, both native Egyptians and foreigners resident in Egypt.

these were those already mentioned, called "*deposyni*"²² because of their relationship to the family of the Saviour, who traveled from the Jewish villages of Nazareth and Cochaba²³ over the rest of the land and explained the aforesaid genealogy from the book of daily records as far as they extended.²⁴ Now, whether this be so or otherwise, no one could find a clear explanation in my opinion and in that of any one who is really well disposed, and let this satisfy us, even if it does lack proof, since we are unable to give a better or more truthful explanation. In any case, the Gospel tells the whole truth.' And at the end of the same letter he adds the following: 'Matthan descended from Solomon begot Jacob.²⁵ When Matthan died, Melchi descended from Nathan begot Eli from the same woman. Therefore, Eli and Jacob were brothers by the same mother. When Eli died without children, Jacob raised up seed to him, having begotten Joseph as his natural son but as the legal son of Eli. Thus, Joseph was the son of both.'

So much for Africanus. Now, since the genealogy of Joseph is so traced, Mary also appears virtually to have been of the same tribe as he, since, according to the law of Moses, intermarriages between different tribes were not permitted,²⁶

22 The Greek word means 'belonging to a master,' the master here being the Lord. It refers to those called above relatives of the Saviour according to the flesh.

23 According to Epiphanius, *Haer.* 30.2,16, a village in Basantide near Decapolis, the seat of Ebionism.

24 Literally, 'the book of days,' taken from the Hebrew, probably an incomplete genealogical source requiring completion from memory, but not any one of the several official sets of records.

25 Cf. Eusebius, *Quaest. ad Steph.*, pp. 232,224.

26 The law referred to here is recorded in Num. 36.6-10: 'Let them marry to whom they will, only so that it be to men of their own tribe, lest the possession of the children of Israel be mingled from tribe to tribe. For all men shall marry wives of their own tribe and kindred; and all women shall take husbands of the same tribe; that the inheritance may remain in the families, and that the tribes be not mingled one with another, but remain so, as they were separated by the Lord.' Cf. also, Ps. 132.11; Acts 11.30 and 13.23; Rom. 1.3.

for it was commanded to join in marriage with one of the same family and of the same people, so that the inheritance of the race might not be changed from tribe to tribe. So, let this also suffice on the present point.

Chapter 8

Now, when Christ was born, according to the prophecies, in Bethlehem of Judaea, at the time indicated, Herod, on being asked by the Magi from the East who were questioning where he might be who was born king of the Jews (for they said that they had seen His star and that this had been the reason for their taking so long a journey, having been caused to worship the infant as God by their zeal), was not a little disturbed at the situation, inasmuch as his sovereignty was in danger, as he thought. On inquiring of the Doctors of the Law among the people where they expected that Christ would be born, and when he learned that the prophecy of Micheas¹ foretold that it would take place in Bethlehem, with a single edict he commanded that infants at their mother's breast, of two years of age and less, both in Bethlehem and its outskirts, be put to death according to the time precisely indicated to him by the Magi, thinking, as was natural, that Jesus would share the same fate as those of His own age. However, the Child anticipated the plot by being taken to Egypt, since His parents had learned through the appearance of an angel what was about to take place. Now, the sacred scripture² of the Gospel also teaches this, but it is worth noting in this connection the result of Herod's crime against Christ and those of like age with Him; for immediately, after not even a short delay, divine justice overtook him while he was still in

¹ Mich. 5.2.

² Matt. 2.1-7 ff.

this life, exhibiting a prelude of what was to be his lot after his departure hence. How, then, he beclouded the so-considered glories of his reign by the successive calamities within his household, by the foul murders of wife and children and of the rest who were especially close in family relationship and most dear to him,³ it is not possible to recount in detail now, for the account of these events, which Josephus has detailed at length⁴ in the history of Herod, overshadow any tragic drama. But it is better to hear from the words of the writer how, as soon as Herod plotted against our Saviour and the other infants, a scourge sent by God seized him and drove him to his death, according to words of him who wrote in Book 17 of the *Jewish Antiquities* as follows: 'But in Herod disease continually grew worse as God exacted punishment for his lawless deeds. For there was a slow fire which did not indicate burning to those who touched him so much as it added distress to his inward parts, and an awful desire to eat, which could not be satisfied, and ulceration of the intestines, and especially extreme pains in the colon, and a moist and transparent dropsy about his feet; similar, too, was an inflammation of the bladder, and even a putrefaction of the genitals breeding worms, and an excessive difficulty in breathing which was very disagreeable because of the offensiveness of the odor and the rapidity of his respiration. Furthermore, he was convulsed in every limb with intolerable severity. So it was said by those who practiced divination and possessed the wisdom to pronounce on these things that God was exacting this punishment from the king for his great impiety.'⁵

Such is the account given by the aforementioned writer

3 Although Herod's reign was very successful and prosperous, his domestic life was constantly disturbed by a series of tragedies resulting from the mutual jealousies of his ten wives and of their children.

4 Cf. the later books of *A.I.* and the first book of the *Jewish Wars*.

5 Josephus, *A.I.* 17.168-170.

in the work quoted, and in Book 2 of the *Jewish Wars* he hands down a similar account about the same king in the following words:⁶ 'Then the disease seized his whole body and tore it asunder with sufferings of all kinds. For he had a slow fever, and an unbearable itching of the whole surface, incessant pains in the colon, and swellings about his feet as if sick with dropsy, and inflammation of the bladder and putrefaction of the genitals breeding worms; besides this, difficulty in breathing and ability to breath only in an upright position, and spasms in every limb, so that those who practiced divination said that his diseases were a punishment. Although he struggled with such sufferings, he clung to life and hoped for deliverance and devised means of cure. So he crossed the Jordan and took the warm baths at Callirhoe.'⁷ These flow into Lake Asphaltites, but because of their sweetness are also drinkable. When the physicians here decided to warm his whole body with hot oil by letting it down into a tub full of oil, he collapsed and lifted up his eyes as if dying. And when an uproar arose among his servants, he recovered at the shock, but despairing of any future deliverance he gave orders for the distribution of fifty drachmas to each of his soldiers and much money to his governors and friends. And he himself turned about and returned to Jericho, now quite melancholy and with difficulty refraining from the threat of suicide, but he proceeded with the planning of a nefarious deed. For he brought together the illustrious men of each village from all Judaea and gave orders to shut them up in the so-called Hippodrome. He then summoned Salome⁸ his sister and her husband Alexas,⁹ and

6 *B.I.* 1.656-660

7 A town just east of the Dead Sea.

8 Full sister of Herod the Great; wife, in succession, of Joseph, Costabarus, and Alexas. She was quite as cruel as Herod himself, and by her jealousy and envy was responsible for most of the terrible tragedies in his life.

9 Usually known as Alexander.

said: 'I know that the Jews will celebrate my death with a festival, but I can be mourned by others and have a splendid funeral, if you be willing to give heed to my commands. Place soldiers around these men who are now under guard, and, as soon as I expire, kill them with all speed, that all Judaea and every house may weep over me even against its will.'¹⁰ And a little later Josephus says: 'And since again he was racked by lack of sustenance and spasmodic cough, because of his pains he gladly felt compelled to anticipate fate. He took an apple and asked also for a knife, for he was accustomed to cut and eat them. Then, looking about lest there might be someone who would prevent him, he raised his right hand as if to stab himself.'¹¹ In addition to all this, the same historian relates¹² that before the end of his life he ordered the murder of another of his legitimate sons, a third in addition to the two previously put to death, and that immediately he ended his life in great agony. Such was the achievement of Herod's death, who paid a just penalty for the murder of the children¹³ in the Bethlehem region which he caused through his plot against our Saviour. After this, an angel,¹⁴ appearing to Joseph who was staying in Egypt, commanded him to return to Judaea with the child and his mother, pointing out that those who sought the life of the

10 *B.I.* 1.662. This horrible story comes from Josephus alone, but it is so in keeping with Herod's character that we have no reason to doubt it. But Herod's commands were not carried out; the men were released by Salome after Herod's death.

11 Josephus, *A.I.* 17.187.191. But Herod did not commit suicide. His cousin, Achiab, prevented it, as Josephus himself informs us in this connection.

12 *B.I.* 1.664.665. Herod had intended that Antipater, his son by his first wife Doris, be his successor in the kingdom, but he was beheaded five days before his father's death for plotting against him.

13 This is the traditional explanation of the cause of Herod's sufferings. Josephus, however, never mentions the slaughter of the innocents, either through ignorance or because of the unimportance of the tragedy as compared with other atrocities of the time.

14 Cf. Matt. 2.19,20.

little Child were dead. The Evangelist continues this account by saying: 'And when he heard that Archelaus was king in place of Herod his father, he was afraid to go back there, and, being warned in a dream, he withdrew into the districts of Galilee.'¹⁵

Chapter 9

The historian mentioned above confirms the establishment in power of Archelaus¹ after Herod, describing the manner in which he succeeded to the kingdom of the Jews by the will of his father Herod and by the decree of Caesar Augustus, and how, when he fell from the throne after a reign of ten years, his brothers Philip² and the young Herod,³ together with Lysanias,⁴ administered their own tetrarchies.

The same historian in Book 18 of the *Antiquities*⁵ shows how Pontius Pilate in the twelfth year of the reign of Tiberius⁶ was entrusted with the government of Judaea (for he had succeeded to the rule of the entire empire after Augustus had

¹⁵ Matt. 2.22.

- ¹ The son of Herod the Great, and own brother of the tetrarch Herod Antipas. On the death of Antipater, Herod named him as his successor in the kingdom, and Augustus confirmed the choice, although he gave him only the title of ethnarch. He is spoken of as king in Matt. 2.22, but only in a general sense. His territory was composed of Idumea, Judea, Samaria, and the cities on the coast, just about half of his father's kingdom. Herod Antipas and Philip divided the other half between them.
- ² A son of Herod the Great by his wife Cleopatra; tetrarch of Batanea, Trachontis, Aurinitis, etc., from 4 B.C. to A.D. 34. He was noted for his justice and moderation.
- ³ Son of Herod the Great by his wife Malthace; tetrarch of Galilee and Perea from 4 B.C. to A.D. 39. It was this Herod who beheaded John the Baptist, and to him that Pilate sent Jesus. The New Testament account clearly describes his character.
- ⁴ Mentioned in Luke 3.1 as tetrarch of Abilene. Eusebius here follows the account of Luke.
- ⁵ Cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 18.32,33,35,89.
- ⁶ I.e., reckoning from A.D. 14, the year in which Augustus died, when Tiberius became sole emperor. Pilate was appointed procurator in A.D. 26, and was recalled in 36.

held the reigns of government for fifty-seven years⁷), and for ten entire years he remained in power, almost until the death of Tiberius. Thus, the forgery of those who recently and formerly distributed acts against our Saviour⁸ has been clearly proved; for in them the very first mention of a date convicts the forgers of falsehood. What they dared to say about the Saviour's passion took place in the fourth consulship of Tiberius, which was the seventh year of his reign, at which time Pilate is shown not yet to have been in charge of Judaea, if one should use Josephus as a witness, who points out so clearly in his work quoted above that Pilate was appointed procurator of Judaea by Tiberius actually in the twelfth year of the reign of Tiberius.

Chapter 10

In the period of these rulers, then, according to the Evangelist,¹ while Tiberius Augustus was passing through the fifteenth year² of his reign and Pontius Pilate the fourth of his governorship, and Herod, Lysanias, and Philip were tetrarchs of the rest of Judaea, our Saviour and Lord, Jesus the Christ of God, entering upon about His thirtieth year,³ was on hand for the baptism of John, and straightway began the promulgation of the Gospel.

The divine Scripture⁴ says that He completed the entire

7 I.e., reckoning from the time of the death of Julius Caesar, and considering Augustus as the second emperor. Augustus did not actually become emperor until 31 B.C., after the battle of Actium.

8 Many acts of Pilate were written by Christians and many of these are still extant. Eusebius is not referring to these here, but rather to those forged by the enemies of the Christians with the approval of Emperor Maximinus.

1 Cf. Luke 3.1.

2 I.e., reckoning from A.D. 14, when Tiberius became sole emperor.

3 Cf. Luke 3.23.

4 Cf. Luke 3.2; also, John 11.49, 51, and 18.13.

time of His teaching while Annas and Caiaphas were high priest,⁵ showing that the entire time of His teaching was included within the years of their administration. Since He began in the high priesthood of Annas and continued until the reign of Caiaphas, the entire intervening time does not amount to four years. For, since the regulations of the law of that time were already being destroyed somehow, there was a relaxation of the rule by which the duties of the service of God were for life and by hereditary descent, and different men at different times were entrusted with the high priesthood by the Roman governors and continued in this office for no more than one year.⁶ Josephus relates that four high priests intervened in succession from Annas to Caiaphas, speaking as follows in the same text of the *Antiquities*:⁷ 'Valerius Gratus⁸ put an end to the priesthood of Annas⁹ and appointed Ishmael¹⁰ the son of Phabi as high priest, and after a short time he removed this one, and named as high priest Eliezer, the son of Annas the high priest. And after a year had passed he removed this one also and passed over the high priesthood to Simon,¹¹ the son of Kamithus. But no more than

5 The singular 'high priest' is harsh both in English and Greek, but it is correctly used, since no more than one high priest could serve at one time. Eusebius tries to get over the difficulty by interpreting the phrase to mean the period between the high priesthoods of Annas and Caiaphas.

6 The high priests were frequently changed by the Roman governors, and there was no regularly prescribed interval. Some continued in office for many years. Thus, Caiaphas was high priest for more than ten years, having been appointed by Pilate and also by his predecessor, Valerius Gratus, and his successor, the Proconsul Vitellius.

7 Josephus, *A.I.* 18.34,35.

8 Made procurator by Tiberius early in his reign. He ruled about eleven years, when he was succeeded by Pilate in A.D. 26.

9 Also known as Annas; was appointed high priest by Quirinius, Governor of Syria, in A.D. 6 or 7. He remained in office until 14 or 15, when he was removed by Valerius Gratus.

10 Either Ishmael or Caiaphas must have held the office of high priest for eight or ten years, or Gratus' period would not be filled up. Eusebius seems to be wrong in limiting his period of office to one year.

11 Otherwise unknown.

a year passed with him in office when Josephus, known also as Caiaphas,¹² became his successor.' So, the entire period of our Saviour's teaching is shown to be not even a complete period of four years, since four high priests from Annas to the appointment of Caiaphas fulfilled an annual service over a period of four years. Hence, the scripture of the Gospel naturally has indicated Caiaphas as the high priest of the year in which the events of the Saviour's passion were fulfilled, and from this also the time of Christ's teaching is shown not to be discordant with the foregoing observation itself. But our Lord and Saviour, not very long after the beginning of His preaching, called the twelve Apostles and to them alone of all His disciples He gave the name of Apostles as a special honor.¹³ Later, He proclaimed seventy others, and them also He sent out two by two in advance of himself into every place and city where He Himself was to come.¹⁴

Chapter 11

The divine scripture of the Gospels¹ recalls that not long afterwards John the Baptist was beheaded by the younger Herod,² and Josephus³ confirms the story, making mention of Herodias⁴ by name, and telling how, although she was the wife of his brother, Herod took her in marriage, after divorcing her who was formerly legally married to him (and

12 Joseph Caiaphas, son-in-law of Annas, well known for his prominence in Gospel history.

13 Cf. Matt. 10.1-4; Mark 3.14-19; Luke 6.13-16; 9.1.

14 Cf. Luke 10.1.

1 Cf. Matt. 14.1-12; Mark 6.14-29; Luke 3.19,20; 9.7-9.

2 Herod Antipas.

3 *A.J.* 18.109-114.

4 Well known from the accounts of the New Testament; a daughter of Aristobulus and granddaughter of Herod the Great. She first married Herod Philip, a son of Herod the Great and so her uncle, who seems

she was the daughter of Aretas⁵ the king of the Petraeans), and separating Herodias from her husband who was still alive. Because of her, he also slew John and waged war against Aretas over the dishonor inflicted upon his daughter. Josephus says that in this war, when they had come to battle, Herod's entire army was destroyed,⁶ and that he suffered this because of the plot which he had carried out against John. The same Josephus,⁷ in confessing that John was among the most righteous of men and a baptist, confirms what has been written about him in the text of the Gospels. He relates, also, that Herod fell from his throne because of the same Herodias, with whom he was driven into exile and condemned to live in Vienne,⁸ a city in Gaul. All this has been related by him in Book 18 of the *Antiquities*, where he writes about John in these very words:⁹ 'To some of the Jews it seemed that the army of Herod had been destroyed by God, who was exacting a very just penalty for John who was called the Baptist. For Herod killed him, a good man who exhorted the Jews, practicing virtue and exercising righteousness toward one another and piety toward God, to come together for baptism; for thus would baptism appear acceptable to Him, only in those who used it not for the renunciation of certain sins but

to have been a person of no great prominence. She deserted him and married another uncle, Herod Antipas the Tetrarch. She was faithful to her second husband, following him into exile and dying there.

5 Aretas Aeneas, King of Arabia Nabataea, whose capital was the famous rock city of Petra. He is the Aretas mentioned in 2 Cor. 11.32 in connection with the flight of St. Paul from Jerusalem.

6 After this disaster Herod appealed to the Emperor Tiberius, who commanded Vitellius, the governor of Syria, to march against Aretas. But the death of Tiberius intervened, and under his successor, Caligula, friendly relations were established between Aretas and the Romans.

7 *A.I.* 18.117; 18.240-255.

8 Josephus gives Lyons rather than Vienne as the place of exile. Eusebius appears to confuse the fate of Herod with that of Archelaus, who was exiled to Vienne.

9 Josephus, *A.I.* 18.116-119. This passage is found also in Origen's *Contra Celsum*.

for the purification of the body, on condition that the soul also had been previously completely cleaned by righteousness. And when the rest were gathered together, for they were exceedingly excited at hearing his words, Herod, fearing his great persuasiveness with men, lest it should lead to some sedition, for they seemed ready to do everything that he advised, thought it much better, before any revolution arose because of John, to seize and destroy him first, rather than to repent afterwards when a revolution had taken place and he had fallen into difficulties.¹⁰ And John, because of Herod's suspicion, was sent in bonds to Macherus,¹¹ the aforementioned prison, and there slain.⁷

After narrating this about John, he also makes mention of our Saviour in the same historical work, as follows: 'And there lived at this time Jesus, a wise man, if indeed it be fitting to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of men who receive the truth with pleasure, and He attracted many of the Jews and many also of the Greek population. This was the Christ; and, when Pilate had condemned Him to the cross on the accusation of the leading men among us, those who had first loved Him did not cease to do so, for He appeared to them on the third day restored to life, the divine Prophets having told these and countless other wonders about Him. And even to the present day the race of Christians who have derived their name from Him has not died out.'¹²

When a writer sprung from the Hebrews themselves has passed on these details in his own work regarding John the Baptist and our Saviour, what escape could there still be

¹⁰ Josephus and the Evangelists differ as to the cause of John's imprisonment. The Evangelists, however, everywhere appear to have more direct and accurate knowledge than does Josephus. Thus, Mark on this matter is far more exact and instructive.

¹¹ An important fortress east of the northern end of the Dead Sea; mentioned above in connection with Herodias.

¹² *A.I.* 18.63,64.

from convicting those who have forged the Reports against them of being devoid of shame? But let this suffice on this subject.

Chapter 12

Now, the names of the Apostles of the Saviour are clear to everyone from the Gospels,¹ but of the seventy disciples² no list is in circulation anywhere. It is said, to be sure, that Barnabas was one of them, and of him the Acts of the Apostles have also made special mention,³ and not the least of these Paul when writing to the Galatians.⁴ And of these, too, they say, was Sosthenes,⁵ who together with Paul wrote to the Corinthians.⁶ And there is the story in Clement,⁷ in Book 5 of the *Hypotyposes*, where he says that Cephas, about whom Paul says:⁸ 'But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to his face,' was one of the seventy disciples⁹ who bore the same name as the Apostle Peter. Tradition also holds¹⁰ that Matthias,¹¹ who was listed among the Apostles in place of Judas, and he¹² who was honored with him at the same

1 Cf. Matt. 10.2-4; Luke 6.13-16; Mark 3.14-19.

2 Cf. Luke 10.1-20.

3 Cf. Acts 4.36; 13.1; *et passim*. Clement of Alexandria in *Strom.* 2.20 speaks of Barnabas as one of the Seventy. This tradition appears probable, but it cannot be traced further back than Clement.

4 Cf. Gal. 2.1,9.

5 Mentioned also in 1 Cor. 1.1. A Sosthenes, ruler of the Jewish synagogue in Corinth, is also mentioned in Acts 18.17, but the two cannot be identified. There is no other ancient evidence for Eusebius' statement here.

6 Cf. 1 Cor. 1.1.

7 On Clement, cf. 5.11,6.13.

8 Gal. 2.11.

9 Clement appears to have been the first to make the distinction between Peter the Apostle and Cephas, one of the Seventy.

10 Cf. Acts 1.23-26.

11 Eusebius seems to have been the first to record this tradition, which is in agreement with Acts 1.21ff.

12 Joseph Barsabas, surnamed Justus, who also had been with Christ from the beginning and so may well have been one of the Seventy.

casting of lots, were deemed worthy of the same calling among the Seventy. And they say that Thaddaeus¹³ also was one of them, about whom I shall presently relate a story which has come down to us. On observation, you would find that the disciples of the Saviour appear to have been more than the Seventy, if you make use of Paul as your source, who says¹⁴ that after the resurrection from the dead He was seen first by Cephas, then by the twelve, and after these by more than five hundred brethren all at once, some of whom he says had fallen asleep, though the majority were still alive at the time that this account was being composed by him. Then he says that He was seen by James; he also belonged to the so-called brethren of the Saviour;¹⁵ then, as if in addition to these there had been a great many apostles in imitation of the twelve, as Paul himself was, he adds these words: 'Then He was seen by all the apostles.'¹⁶ So much, then, about these.

Chapter 13

The sense of the story about Thaddeus is as follows. The divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, being noised among all men because of His wonder-working power, attracted countless, even of those who were very remote from Judaea in foreign lands, in hope of being cured of diseases

13 He appears on the lists of Apostles as given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and is identical with Jude and Lebbaeus. Cf. Jerome, *In Matt.* 10. Eusebius separates him from the Apostles and places him among the Seventy, but this is an error similar to that which he made in the case of Peter and Cephas.

14 Cf. 1 Cor. 15.5-7.

15 The relationship of James and Jesus has ever been a matter of great dispute. A number of ingenious theories have been advanced and anything like a unanimity of opinion is far distant.

16 1 Cor. 15.7.

and sufferings of all kinds. Thus, King Abgar,¹ who ruled most gloriously over the nations beyond the Euphrates, suffered from a terrible bodily ailment beyond any cure by a human power. On hearing much of the name of Jesus and of the miracles attested unanimously by all, he became His suppliant, communicating with Him through a letter-bearer and begging to receive relief from his disease. Jesus did not give heed to his request at the time, but deemed him worthy of a personal letter in which He promised to send one of His disciples for the cure of his disease and for the salvation alike of himself and all his relatives. Not long afterwards, the terms of the promise were fulfilled by Him. After His resurrection from the dead and ascent into heaven, Thomas,² one of the twelve Apostles, by divine inspiration sent Thaddeus to Edessa,³ himself also listed among the Seventy disciples of Christ, as a herald and evangelist of the teaching about Christ, and through him all the terms of our Saviour's promise received fulfilment. You have, furthermore, written evidence of these events taken from the archives at Edessa,⁴ which at that time was a capital city. At any rate,

1 Several kings of this name ruled at Edessa from 99 B.C. to A.D. 217. The present Abgar, called Abgar Ucomo, or 'the Black,' was the fifteenth king and ruled from A.D. 13 to 50. A great many stories have grown up around his name. There is no doubt about the forgery of this correspondence.

2 On tradition pertaining to Thomas, cf. 3.1.

3 The capital of Abgar's kingdom, a city in Northern Mesopotamia, near the river Euphrates. Tradition places its origin in deep antiquity, and it has even been identified with Abraham's original home, Ur of the Chaldees. In the history of the Church it has played an important role as a center of Syrian learning. A seminary was established there by Ephraem, the Syrian, in the fourth century. After Ephraem's death it fell into the hands of the Arians.

4 In all probability, Eusebius actually found these apocryphal epistles in the public archives at Edessa. We have no good reason to doubt him. Moses Chorenensis, an Armenian historian of the fifth century, is a witness to their existence in the Edessene archives. Furthermore, the original Syriac has been discovered and published; cf. *Contemp. Rev.* (May 1877) 1137. Thus, it is foolish to accuse Eusebius of having forged the correspondence himself, as some have done. However, the apocryphal character of the letters cannot well be doubted.

in the public documents there which contain the things done in the past and in the time of Abgar, these events also are found preserved from that time to the present. But there is nothing like hearing the letters themselves, which we took from the archives and translated literally from the Syriac language as follows:

A copy of a letter written by Abgar the ruler to Jesus and sent to Him through the courier Ananias to Jerusalem.

'Abgar Uchama, to Jesus the good Saviour who has appeared in the region of Jerusalem, greeting. The reports about you and your cures have reached me, how they are effected by you without drugs and herbs. For, as the story goes,⁵ you make the blind to see, the lame to walk, and you cleanse lepers, and you cast out unclean spirits and demons, and you cure those who are tortured in lingering disease, and you raise the dead. When I heard all this about you, I decided that either one of two things is true, either that you are God, and having come down from heaven are doing these things, or you are a Son of God,⁶ who does these things. On this account, then, I have written to beg you to hasten to me and to cure me of the suffering which I have. For I have heard⁷ also that the Jews murmur against you and wish to harm you. But I have a very small and venerable city which is enough for us both.'⁸

The reply written by Jesus to Abgar, the ruler, through the courier Ananias.

⁵ Matt. 11:5; Luke 7:22.

⁶ As used here, this expression would not be used by a heathen prince.

⁷ Cf. Eccle. 9:14.

⁸ Some manuscripts add the following: 'And he wrote in this way when the divine illumination had but a little shone on him. But it is also worth while to hear the letter sent to him by Jesus by the same bearer of the letter. It has only a few lines but great power, and goes as follows.'

'Blessed are you who have believed although you have not seen me.⁹ For it is written concerning me that those who have seen me will not believe in me, and that those who have not seen me will themselves believe and shall be saved. But regarding what you wrote me, to come to you, I must fulfill all things for which I was sent, and, after thus fulfilling them, be taken up to Him who sent me. And when I have been taken up, I shall send you one of my disciples to heal your suffering and to give life to you and those with you.'

The following, in the Syriac tongue, is also joined with these letters:

'Now after He was taken up, Judas,¹⁰ who is also Thomas, sent to him Thaddeus, an Apostle,¹¹ one of the Seventy, who went and stayed with Tobias,¹² the son of Tobias. And when the news of him was received,¹³ it was reported to Abgar that an Apostle of Jesus has come here as He wrote you. So Thaddeus¹⁴ began in the power of God to heal every ill and weakness, so that all marveled. And when Abgar heard the great deeds and miracles which he was doing, and how he was performing cures, he began to suspect that he was the one of whom Jesus wrote, saying: "When I have been taken up, I shall send you one of my disciples, who will heal your suffering." So he summoned Tobias, with whom Thaddeus was staying, and said: "I have heard that a certain man of power has come and is staying in your house. Bring

9 Cf. John 20.29; Isa. 6.9ff.; Matt. 13.14ff.; John 12.39ff.

10 Thomas is called Judas Thomas in the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas, and in the Syriac *Doctrina Apostolorum*.

11 The word 'apostle' was used very commonly in a wide sense and was not confined to the twelve Apostles of Christ.

12 Probably a Jew; the name is very common among the Hebrews.

13 Some manuscripts have here: 'And he had become manifest by the wonders wrought by him.'

14 Cf. Matt. 4.23; 9.35; 10.1.

him to me.”¹⁵ And Tobias came to Thaddeus and said to him: “The ruler Abgar summoned me and told me to bring you to him, that you may heal him.” And Thaddeus said: “I will go up, since I have been sent to him miraculously.” So Tobias arose early on the next day and, taking Thaddeus, went to Abgar. And when he went up, while the king’s nobles were standing about, immediately on his entrance there appeared to Abgar a great vision on the face of the Apostle Thaddeus. When Abgar saw this, he did reverence to Thaddeus, and wonder seized all who stood about, for they themselves did not see the vision which appeared to Abgar alone. And he asked Thaddeus: “Are you in truth a disciple of Jesus, the Son of God, who said to me, ‘I will send you one of my disciples who will heal you and give you life’?” And Thaddeus said: “Since you have had a great faith in Him who sent me, on this account have I been sent to you. And again, if you believe in Him, in so far as you believe, the requests of your heart shall be yours.” And Abgar said to him: “I have so believed in Him that I was ready to take force and cut down the Jews who crucified Him, had I not been cut off from this by the Roman Empire.” And Thaddeus said: “Our Lord has fulfilled the will of His Father, and having fulfilled it was taken up to the Father.” And Abgar said to him: “I, too, have believed in him and in His Father.” And Thaddeus said: “For this reason I place my hand upon you in His name.” And when he had done this, he was immediately healed from the disease and the suffering which he had. And Abgar marveled that just as he had heard about Jesus, so he had received in fact through His disciple Thaddeus, who had healed him without drugs and herbs, and not him alone, but

¹⁵ Some manuscripts add here: “And he is working many cures in the name of Jesus.” And he said, “Yes, Lord. A certain stranger came and is living with me, and is working many wonders.” And Abgar said, “Bring him to me.”

also Abdus, the son of Abdus, who had the gout; for he, too, came and threw himself at his feet, and after receiving prayers at his hands was healed. The same Thaddeus cured many others of their fellow citizens, performing great and marvelous deeds and preaching the word of God. And after this Abgar said: "You, Thaddeus, do these things by the power of God and we in turn have marveled. But, besides this, I beg, you, tell me about the coming of Jesus, how it happened, and about His power, and by what power He did those things of which I have heard." And Thaddeus said: "Now, indeed, shall I be silent, but, since I was sent to preach the word, tomorrow call together for me all your citizens, and I shall preach among them, and shall sow in them the word of life, both about the coming of Jesus, how it happened, and about His mission, and why He was sent by the Father, and about His power and His works and the mysteries which He spoke in the world, and by what power He did these things, and about His new preaching, and about His lowliness and humiliation, and how He humbled Himself¹⁶ and put aside and made His divinity lowly, and descended into Hades,¹⁷ and broke asunder the barrier which had not been broken from the beginning of the world, and raised the dead and descended alone, and with a great multitude ascended to His Father."¹⁸ Abgar, therefore, gave orders to assemble his citizens in the morning and to hear the preaching of Thaddeus, and after this he commanded that gold and plate be given him, but he did not accept it, saying: "If we have

16 Cf. Phil. 2.8.

17 Probably the earliest distinct and formal statement of the descent into Hades, but it is made very casual and was probably commonly accepted at Edessa at the time of the writing of these records.

18 Some manuscripts continue: 'And how he is seated on the right hand of God and the Father with glory in the Heavens, and how he will come again with power to judge the living and the dead.'

abandoned our own possessions, how shall we take those of others?" These things were done in the 340th year.¹⁹

Let this translation from the Syriac language, made literally and not without profit, suffice me for the present.

19 The 340th year of the Edessene era, which according to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius began with the year of Abraham 1706 or 310 B.C., would be A.D. 30. This agrees with the date of the crucifixion as given by Tertullian, Lactantius, Augustine, and others. It is, however, one year earlier than the date which appears in Jerome's version of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius and two years earlier than the date which is given in the Armenian version of the same book.

BOOK TWO



ALL THAT THE HISTORY of the Church needed to have stated by way of an introduction—the proofs of the divinity of the saving Logos, the ancient history of the doctrines which we teach, the antiquity of the evangelical life which Christians lead, especially everything connected with His recent appearance, the events preceding His passion, and the story of His choice of Apostles, we have discussed briefly in the preceding Book. Let us now, in the present Book, examine the events after His Ascension, noting some from the divine writings, relating others in addition from other sources, from such documents as we shall mention from time to time.

Chapter 1

Matthias,¹ then, was the first to be chosen to the apostolate in place of the traitor Judas, he too, as has been shown,² having been one of the Lord's disciples. There were appointed

1 Cf. Acts 1.23-26.

2 Cf. above, 1.2.

to the diaconate³ for the service of the group, by prayer and by the laying on of the Apostles' hands, tried men to the number of seven, led by Stephen.⁴ And he was the first after the Lord, at the time of his ordination, as if promoted for this very purpose,⁵ to be stoned to death and thus the first to bear away the crown, implied by his name,⁶ of the martyrs of Christ deemed worthy of victory.

At that very time, also, James, said to be brother of the Lord,⁷ because he, too, was called the child of Joseph,⁸ and Joseph was called the father of Christ, for the Virgin was betrothed to him when, before they came together, she was found to be with child by the Holy Spirit, as the holy scripture of the Gospels teaches⁹—this very James, whom the ancients also called by the surname of Just¹⁰ for excellence of virtue, is recorded to have been the first to be entrusted with the throne of the bishopric of the Church of Jerusalem. Clement, writing in Book 6 of the *Hypotyposes*,¹¹ gives the following account. He says Peter and James and John, after the Ascension of the Saviour, as if preferred by the Saviour,

3 Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1.26.3; 3.12.10; 4.15.1.) appears to be the first to call the 'Seven' deacons, as does Cyprian (*Ep.* 64.3). This was the commonly accepted opinion of the Church in the West during the third century, and has been almost universally accepted ever since. The ancient Church, however, was not unanimous in this opinion. St. John Chrysostom (*Hom. 14 on Acts*) denies it, as do some worthy modern scholars.

4 Cf. Acts 6.1-6.

5 Cf. Acts 7.58, 59.

6 In Greek *stephanos* means 'crown.'

7 Cf. above, 1.12.

8 Eusebius by these words appears to favor the half-brother theory. If he had regarded James as the son of Mary, he would not have spoken in this manner.

9 Cf. Matt. 1.18.

10 James was known as the Just throughout history, although he is not so called in the New Testament. Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius in Ch. 23, says that James was called the Just by all from the time of Christ, because of his great piety.

11 Regarding Clement's *Hypotyposes*, cf. below, 6.13. On Clement's life and writings, cf. below, 5.11.

did not struggle for glory, but chose James the Just as Bishop of Jerusalem.¹² The same author, in Book 7 of the same work, says this also about him: 'To James the Just and to John and to Peter the Lord after the Resurrection gave the tradition of knowledge; these passed it on to the other Apostles, and the other Apostles to the Seventy, of whom Barnabas¹³ also was one. But there were two Jameses,¹⁴ one the Just—he was cast down from the pinnacle of the temple and was beaten to death with a fuller's club¹⁵—and the other who was beheaded.'¹⁶

Paul also makes mention of the Just himself, writing: 'But I saw none of the other apostles, except James, the brother of the Lord.'¹⁷

While these things were taking place, the terms of our Saviour's promise to the king of the Osroenes were receiving fulfilment. For Thomas, under divine inspiration, sent Thaddaeus to Edessa as a preacher and an evangelist of the teaching of Christ, as we have shown a little above from the writing discovered there.¹⁸ On reaching the place, Thaddaeus healed Abgar, and astonished all the people there by the

12 James the Just probably became very prominent in the Church of Jerusalem soon after Christ's ascension. Paul, some time between 37 and 40, sees him as well as Peter on visiting Rome. At the Jerusalem Council of 51 (Cf. Acts 15 and Gal. 2), he is one of the three pillars on an equal footing with Peter and John. However, he was not a bishop in the modern sense, since the episcopacy as we know it did not develop until the second century, although writers of this century and later regularly threw back their own church organization into the apostolic age.

13 Cf. above, 1.2.

14 Clement identifies James, the brother of the Lord, with James, the son of Alphaeus. There were, however, many of this name.

15 Josephus (*Ant.* 20.9.1) says that he was stoned to death. This account by Clement agrees with that of Hegesippus as quoted by Eusebius in Ch. 23.

16 James, the son of Zebedee, beheaded by Herod Agrippa I in 44. Cf. Acts 12.2; also, below, 2.9.

17 Gal. 1.19.

18 Cf. above, 1.13.

strangeness of his miracles; and after properly disposing them by his deeds and bringing them to a reverence of the power of Christ, he established disciples of the saving teaching, and from that time to the present the entire city of the Edessenes has been devoted to the name of Christ,¹⁹ displaying no casual proof of our Saviour's beneficence even toward them. Let this suffice from the history of the ancients, and let us turn again to the sacred Scripture.

When, upon the martyrdom of Stephen,²⁰ the first and greatest persecution of the Church in Jerusalem took place at the hands of the Jews themselves, and all the disciples with the exception of the Twelve alone were scattered throughout Judaea and Samaria,²¹ some, as the sacred Scripture says, although dispersed as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, were not yet able to dare to impart the word of the faith to Gentiles, and were announcing it to the Jews alone. At that time, also,²² Paul was still inflicting outrage upon the Church, entering into the houses of the faithful, dragging out men and women and committing them to prison. Philip, however, one of those who with Stephen had already been ordained to the diaconate,²³ being among those who were scattered abroad,²⁴ went down to Samaria, and, being filled with divine power, was the first to preach the Word to those there, and so great was the divine grace that worked with him that Simon Magus, with countless others, was attracted by his words.²⁵ Simon at that time had obtained such fame and by his trickery wielded such power over his victims that he was held

19 In the third century, Edessa was the seat of a bishop; in Eusebius' time it was filled with beautiful churches and monasteries.

20 Cf. Acts 8.1.

21 Cf. Acts 11.19.

22 Cf. Acts 8.3.

23 Cf. Acts 6.5.

24 Cf. Acts 8.5-13.

25 Cf. Acts 8.9ff. Regarding Simon, cf. below, 2.13.

to be the Great Power of God.²⁶ But he, too, at that time, being astounded at the marvels wrought by Philip with divine power, yielded and feigned faith in Christ even to the point of baptism.²⁷ And it is worthy of wonder that this is still done by those who even to the present day continue his most impure heresy,²⁸ for, following the method of their forefather they slip into the Church like a pestilential and scabby disease and ravage exceedingly those into whom they are able to infuse the deadly and terrible poison concealed in them. Most of these, indeed, have already been driven out, as many as have been caught in their wickedness, just as Simon himself, when his real character was detected by Peter, paid the proper punishment.²⁹ While the saving preaching was increasing and advancing day by day, a certain providence brought from the land of the Ethiopians an officer of the queen of that country,³⁰ for according to an ancestral custom the nation is even to this day ruled by a woman. Tradition holds that he was the first

26 Cf. Acts 8.10: 'This man is the power of God, which is called great.' According to Irenaeus (1.23.1), he was called 'the loftiest power, that is, he who is father over all things'; according to Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1.26), 'the first God'; according to Clement (*Hom.* 2.22), he wished to be called 'a supreme power of God,' and (*Recog.* 2.7) 'the standing one.'

27 Here we have the universal belief of the early Church which judged Simon to be the founder of all heresies, the arch-heretic himself, and the great hypocrite.

28 A heretical sect, called the Simonians, is mentioned by Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and others. Although they originated at a later date, they looked upon Simon as their founder and leader, and even as God. They were very licentious and immoral. Their teaching gradually became of a Gnostic character, and Simon came to be regarded as the father of all the Gnostics. Cf. Irenaeus 1.27.4. Eusebius may be referring here to the Gnostics or to heretics in general.

29 Cf. Acts 8.18-23.

30 Cf. Acts 8.26-38. According to the Bible, the queen was Candace, although this was the name of a dynasty of queens and not of an individual. They ruled over Meroë, an island formed by two branches of the Nile, south of Egypt. Cf. Pliny (*H. N.* 6.35), Cassius Dio (54.5), and Strabo (17.1.54).

of the Gentiles to receive the mysteries of the divine word from Philip through revelation, and was the first to return to his native land and preach the Gospel of the knowledge of the God of the universe and the life-giving sojourn of our Saviour among men,³¹ and thus in fact was the prophecy fulfilled by him which says, 'Ethiopia shall stretch out her hand to God.'³² In addition to these, Paul, the chosen vessel³³ not from men nor by men,³⁴ but by the revelation of Jesus Christ Himself and of God the Father who raised Him from the dead, was appointed an Apostle, being made worthy of the call by a vision and by a voice which was uttered in a revelation from heaven.³⁵

Chapter 2

Now, when the marvelous resurrection of our Saviour and His ascension into heaven were already generally noised about, since an ancient custom prevailed among those who ruled the nations of reporting to him who held the imperial office any novel occurrences that took place among them, in order that nothing that happened might escape him, Pilate communicated to the Emperor Tiberius¹ the account of the resurrection from the dead of our Saviour Jesus which had

31 Although Eusebius and Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3.12.8) seem to agree on this account of the origin of Christianity in Ethiopia, there is much uncertainty about it. Cf. the article on the 'Ethiopian Church' by H. R. Reynolds, in Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

32 Ps. 67.32.

33 Cf. Acts 9.15.

34 Cf. Gal. 1.1.

35 Cf. Acts 9.3-6; 22.6ff.; 26.12ff.; Gal. 1.16; 1 Cor. 15.8-10.

1 Tertullian (*Apol.* 21) also states that Pilate made an official report to Tiberius, and this seems quite probable. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1.35,38) speaks of certain *Acts of Pilate* as well known in his day. However, the various so-called *Acts of Pilate*, which are extant today, are obviously fictitious and belong to a much later period. The most important of these *Acts* is the one commonly known as the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. We also possess today numerous fictitious epistles of Pilate to Herod,

already been spread among all throughout the whole of Palestine, and other wonders which he had learned about Him, including how, on having arisen from the dead after death, He was already believed by many to be a God. They say that Tiberius referred the report to the Senate and that the Senate rejected it, ostensibly because it had not tested the matter previously, since an ancient law prevailed that no one be held a god by the Romans except by a vote and decree of the Senate, but in reality because the saving teaching of the divine Gospel did not need confirmation and recommendation from men. So, when the council of the Romans thus rejected the report of our Saviour which had been announced, it was said that Tiberius clung to the opinion which he had held formerly and contrived nothing unusual against the teaching of Christ.² Tertullian,³ who had an accurate knowledge of the laws⁴ of the Romans, of high repute in other respects and one of the most brilliant men at Rome,⁵ gives the following account in his *Apology*⁶ for the Christians which he wrote in

to Tiberius, to Claudius, and to others. See Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, and the article of Lipsius on 'Apocryphal Gospels' in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* 2 707ff.

- 2 It is true that Tiberius did not persecute the Christians, but this is probably due to the fact that they attracted no notice during his reign, not that he had any respect for them or their beliefs.
- 3 Born in Carthage about the middle of the second century. He was converted to Christianity between 180 and 190, and according to Jerome and a few others was a presbyter, although this last is seriously doubted.
- 4 Tertullian's deep knowledge of the law is seriously doubted. He probably was noted rather for his eloquence and resourcefulness.
- 5 In all probability, a very successful practitioner of the law and rhetoric in Rome up to the time of his conversion.
- 6 Tertullian's *Apology* is the most important of all his extant works. It is the highest example of this norm of literature as developed by the early Christians. The date of its composition is quite uncertain, but the work is regarded by some literary critics as the earliest extant example of Latin Christian literature.

Latin and which was translated into Greek,⁷ recounting thus by way of explanation:⁸ 'But, in order that we may discuss such laws from their origin, there was an ancient decree that no one should be consecrated a god by an emperor before it had been approved by the Senate. Marcus Aemilius so acted with regard to a certain idol Alburnus.⁹ And this act supports our argument that among you godship is granted by man's approval. If a god does not please a man, he does not become god; so, according to this man must be gracious to God. Tiberius, then, in whose rule the name of Christian came into the world, when this doctrine was reported to him from Palestine, where it first began, communicated with the Senate, making it clear to them that he was pleased with the doctrine.¹⁰ But the Senate, because it itself had not tested it, rejected it, but Tiberius remained firm in his own opinion and threatened death to the accusers of the Christians.'¹¹ Heavenly Providence designedly injected this into his mind in order that the word of the Gospel with unhampered beginnings might traverse the earth in every direction.

7 Eusebius' knowledge of Latin was very limited. This is confirmed by the fact that he shows little acquaintance with the works of Latin writers in general. He actually does not show any personal acquaintance with any of the important Latin works produced before his time, except such as existed in Greek translations. The only work of Tertullian which he quotes is the *Apology*, and this from a very poor Greek translation.

8 Tert., *Apol.* 5.

9 This *eidōlos* or *Deus Alburnus* is mentioned by no one other than Tertullian. He is otherwise unknown.

10 This entire account cannot be thought genuine; it bears all the marks of untruthfulness.

11 Eusebius implies that the following sentence is Tertullian's, whereas this is not so indicated in the Latin manuscripts. If this conduct of Tiberius were true, Trajan's rescript and all succeeding action upon the subject would be impossible of explanation.

Chapter 3

Thus, then, by heavenly power and co-operation, like a sun ray, the saving Word quickly illumined the whole earth.¹ Straightway, in accordance with the divine Scripture,² the voice of its inspired evangelists and Apostles 'went forth to the whole earth and their words to the end of the world.' And then in all the cities and villages churches were quickly established, filled with multitudes of people, like a teeming threshing floor,³ and all those souls, bound through hereditary succession and original error by the ancient disease of idolatrous superstition, on being set free as it were from terrible masters and finding release from most difficult bondage by the power of Christ through both the teaching of His disciples and their wonderful works, rejected all demoniacal polytheism and confessed that there was one God alone, the Creator of all things, and this One Himself they honored with the rites of true piety through inspired and rational worship which was implanted by our Saviour in the life of men. But, when the divine grace was already being poured out upon the rest of the nations, and when Cornelius⁴ with his whole house was the first in Caesarea of Palestine to receive faith in Christ through divine revelation and the ministration of Peter, and when a great many other Greeks also received it at Antioch,⁵ to whom those who had been scattered in the persecution against Stephen preached, and when the Church at Antioch was already flourishing and abounding, and when so many of the prophets from Jerusalem were also on hand in the same place,⁶ and with them Barnabas and Paul, and a great multitude of the brethren besides these, the name of

1 Cf. Col. 1.6. A slight exaggeration.

2 Cf. Ps. 18.5.

3 Cf. Matt. 3.12; Luke 3.17.

4 Cf. Acts 10.

5 Cf. Acts 11.20-30.

6 Cf. Acts 11.22ff.

Christian first sprang up here,⁷ as from a fresh and life-giving fountain. Agabus,⁸ also, one of the prophets who were with them, prophesied about the future occurrence of a famine,⁹ and Paul and Barnabas were sent to give aid to the ministry of the brethren.¹⁰

Chapter 4

Tiberius,¹ after reigning for about twenty-two years,² now died; after him, Caius took over the sovereignty³ and straight-way bestowed the crown of the rule of the Jews upon Agrippa,⁴ making him King of Philip and Lysaneas; and besides these, not long after, he gave in addition the tetrarchy of Herod, punishing Herod (this was he of the Saviour's passion⁵), as well as his wife Herodias, for a great many offences by perpetual exile.⁶ Of these events, too, Josephus is witness.⁷

7 Cf. Acts 11.26. The name 'Christian' was first given to the disciples by the pagans of Antioch and not by the Jews, to whom the word 'Christ' meant much. Nor did the disciples give it to themselves, since the term rarely appears in the New Testament and never with a disciple. The word itself is a Latinism, but Latinisms in Greek were common at that time. The word was originally used out of contempt, but was accepted by the disciples as of highest honor.

8 Cf. Acts 11.28. Agabus is known only from this passage and Acts 21.10, where he foretells the imprisonment of Paul.

9 This famine took place during the reign of Claudius. When Eusebius again speaks of this famine in Ch. 8, he so places it.

10 Cf. Acts 11.29,30.

1 Josephus, *A.I.* 18.224; *B.I.* 2.180.

2 From August 29, 14, to March 16, 37.

3 Caius was in power from the death of Tiberius to Jan. 24, 41.

4 Herod Agrippa I, son of Aristobulus and grandson of Herod the Great. The Herod of the next sentence is Herod Antipas, Agrippa's uncle.

5 Cf. Luke 23.7-11.

6 He was banished in 39, either to Lugdunum in Gaul or to Spain, according respectively to Josephus' *A.I.* 17.7.2 or to his *B.I.* 2.9.6. According to *B.I.* 2.9.6, he died in Spain.

7 Cf. Josephus, *A.I.* 18.237, 252, 255; and *B.I.* 2.9.

In this reign, Philo⁸ became known to a great many, not only among our own but also among those who came from abroad, as a man most distinguished for his erudition. By race, he was of Jewish origin; of those of distinguished authority in Alexandria, inferior to none. How much and how well he expended his labors on theological and national learning is clear to all from his work, and of his position in the philosophical and liberal studies of the pagan world it is not necessary to speak, since he is reported to have surpassed all the men of his time, especially in his zeal⁹ in the study of Plato and Pythagoras.

Chapter 5

Now, this writer has in five books handed down an account of what happened to the Jews under Caius,¹ de-

8 An Alexandrian Jew, born about 20-10 B.C. The only fixed date that we have in his career is the embassy to Caligula in A.D. 40, and he lived some time after this. St. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 11) speaks of him as born of a priestly family, but there is no further evidence for this. He was a philosopher thoroughly imbued with Greek spirit, and tried to unite Jewish belief with Jewish culture. He was of great influence upon the thinking of later ages, especially upon Christian theology. His works (Biblical, historical, practical, philosophical, and others) were very numerous and are almost all extant. Cf. below, 2.18.

9 Philo was a very learned man, especially in all branches of Greek literature. He honored and studied all the Greek philosophers, but was chiefly attracted to Plato, as is evident from the Platonic influence in his thought and language. His system of philosophy was eclectic, and contains in addition to its Platonic features Pythagorean and even Stoic elements.

1 Apparently, this work was entitled *On the Virtues*. Of the five books, only the third and fourth are extant. Book 1 probably contained an introduction. Book 2 contained an account of the oppression of the Jews under Tiberius by Sejanus in Rome, and by Pilate in Judaea; Book 3, of the persecution of the Jews of Alexandria at the beginning of Caius' reign. Book 4 relates the sufferings which befell the Jews by Caius' command that divine honors be shown him throughout the Empire. Book 5 discusses the change for the better in the condition of the Jews through the death of Caius, and the Edict of Toleration published by Claudius. See also Ch. 18 for the other works of Philo.

scribing completely the insanity of Caius: how he announced himself as a god and performed innumerable acts of insolence during his reign; the miseries of the Jews in his time and the mission which he himself made when he set out for Rome in behalf of fellow countrymen in Alexandria;² and how, when he stood in the presence of Caius in behalf of his ancestral laws, he received nothing but laughter and ridicule, almost incurring risk to his life.

Josephus³ also mentions these things, writing as follows in Book 18 of the *Antiquities*: 'Now, when discord arose in Alexandria between the Jews and the Greeks who dwelt there, three representatives were chosen from each faction and appeared before Caius. One of the Alexandrian representatives was Apion,⁴ who uttered many blasphemies against the Jews, saying among other things that they neglected the honors due to Caesar, and that, while all, as many as were subject to the rule of the Romans, erected altars and temples to Caius and in other respects received him as they did the gods, those alone considered it improper to honor him with

2 A terrible disturbance between the Jews and Greeks of Alexandria had continued with only occasional brief interruptions for more than a year. Affairs were becoming constantly worse, with increasing bloodshed. With all hope for peace abandoned, the Greeks sent an embassy to Caius in A.D. 40, thinking to secure an edict for the extermination of the Jews. The Jews, in turn, sent an embassy in their own defense, with Philo at its head. The account of the result as given here by Eusebius is apparently correct. The Jews, however, were soon relieved of their suffering by the death of Caius. Caius' successor, Claudius, restored their religious freedom and earlier privileges, at least for a time.

3 Cf. *A.I.* 18.257-260.

4 Chief of the Greek deputies, a grammarian of Alexandria, and a writer and Greek scholar of high reputation. He apparently was most unscrupulous and profligate, and a persistent enemy of the Jews. He attacked the Jews very severely in his *Egyptian History* and in a special work *Against the Jews*, both now lost, spreading much malicious falsehood and doing them great harm. Josephus replied with his work *Against Apion*, still extant, in which he exposed Apion's absurd and malicious lies.

statues and to swear by his name. But, although Apion had made many serious charges, by which he had hope to rouse Caius as was natural, Philo, who stood at the head of the Jewish embassy, a man famous in every respect, being the brother of Alexander the Alabarch⁵ and a philosopher of no little skill, was able in a defense to deal with these accusations, but Caius cut him short, ordering him to get out of the way, and was clearly very angry and on the point of doing something terrible to them. And Philo went out greatly insulted, and told the Jews who were with him that they must be of good courage, since Caius, although angry against them, was already in fact fighting against God.'

Thus far Josephus. And Philo himself, in the *Embassy* which he composed, presents in accurate detail what he did at that time. Most of these I shall pass over. I shall set forth only those by which it will be clearly evident to the reader that misfortunes happened to the Jews at the same time as and not long after their crimes against Christ, and on account of them. He first relates that in the city of the Romans, in the time of Tiberius, Sejanus, a man among the emperor's followers who enjoyed great influence, eagerly strove to destroy the entire race utterly, and that in Judaea, Pilate, under whom the crimes against the Saviour were committed, made an attempt against the Temple which was still standing

5 The chief magistrate of the Jews at Alexandria. Alexander, a very rich and influential Jew, was widely known and highly regarded. His son, Tiberius Alexander, succeeded Cuspius Fodus as procurator of Judaea in A.D. 46. This has been questioned, but without sufficient ground.

6 *Legatio ad Gaium* 24.38.

7 Under the first emperor, Augustus, the Jews enjoyed great favor and influence and increased greatly in numbers. Tiberius, the next emperor, however, was very hostile, probably under the influence of Sejanus, a deadly enemy of the Jews, who had great influence with him. The Jews suffered much at this time and were eventually driven out of Rome. On the death of Sejanus, however, in A.D. 31 they were allowed to return and to enjoy all their former rights.

at that time in Jerusalem, contrary to a privilege granted the Jews, and harassed them extremely.⁸

Chapter 6

And Philo relates that, after the death of Tiberius, Caius succeeded to the rule and committed numerous other crimes against many, but most of all he did no small injury to the entire nation of the Jews.¹ These matters can be learned briefly through his words,² in which he writes exactly as follows: 'Now Caius' character had a kind of extreme capriciousness toward all, but especially toward the race of the Jews, which he hated bitterly. In other³ cities, beginning with those in Alexandria, he appropriated their places of worship, filling them with images and statues of his own form (for by permitting others to set them up he did in fact install them himself), and the Temple in Jerusalem, which had been left untouched and had been regarded as worthy of preservation from all violation, he changed and transformed into a temple of his own, to be called the temple of "Caius, the new Zeus manifest."'

The same author relates in a second work which he wrote

8 Pilate was very tyrannical and obnoxious to the Jews, and offended them constantly during his administration by disregarding their religious scruples. Thus, on one occasion, he seized a part of the treasure of the Temple to construct an aqueduct. This caused a great tumult which was checked only after much bloodshed. Cf. Josephus *B.I.* 2.9.4.

1 Caius' hostility against the Jews was the result chiefly of their refusal to pay him divine honors, as all his subjects were required to do. He even demanded that the Temple in Jerusalem be devoted to his worship. Such demands created great tumults in Alexandria and Jerusalem, which were quieted only by the emperor's yielding at the request of Agrippa. The latter was in Rome at the time and in high favor with the emperor.

2 Philo, *Legatio ad Caium* 43.

3 Philo probably means all cities except Jerusalem, to which he refers below.

On the Virtues,⁴ innumerable other misfortunes, terrible and beyond all description, that befell the Jews during the reign of the emperor just mentioned, and Josephus also agrees with him, also pointing out that the misfortunes of the whole nation began with the time of Pilate and of the crimes against the Saviour.⁵ Hear, then, what this author points out in Book 2 of the *Jewish War*, as he speaks with these very words: 'Now, Pilate, being sent as procurator into Judaea by Tiberius, conveyed the concealed images of Caesar by night into Jerusalem. These images are called ensigns. On the following day this caused a very great commotion among the Jews. Those nearby were shocked at the sight, since their laws had been trampled under foot; for they do not permit any image to be set up in the city.'⁶

Comparing all this with the writing of the Gospels, you will see that not long afterwards there came upon them the cry that they sent forth in the presence of Pilate himself, when they shouted that they had no king but Caesar alone.⁷ Then the same writer goes on to relate that another misfortune came upon them, in these words:⁸ 'And after this he stirred up another commotion by expending the sacred treasury, called Corban,⁹ for an aqueduct which extended for three hundred stadia.¹⁰ There was great displeasure on the part of

4 Probably an alternative title for the work mentioned in the beginning of Ch. 5 as the *Embassy*.

5 Eusebius' assumption is not justified. Josephus does not even hint that the calamities of the Jews were the penalty for their crime against the Saviour.

6 *B.I.* 2.169,170.

7 John 19.15.

8 *B.I.* 2.175-177.

9 Originally, any offering to God, especially an offering in fulfilment of a vow. As used here it denotes the sacred treasure or the treasury itself. It is used in this sense in Matt. 27.6, the only place where it occurs in the New Testament.

10 The location of this aqueduct is not known with certainty. However, the remains of an ancient aqueduct have been found south of Jerusalem, which may well be the one in question.

the multitude at this, and when Pilate was present in Jerusalem they stood about and shouted against him. But he had foreseen their disturbance, and he had intermingled among the multitude armed soldiers disguised in citizen's clothing. He had forbidden them to use the sword, but had ordered them to use clubs on those who had made an outcry, and he gave a signal for this from his tribunal. Many Jews perished by being struck with blows, and many by being trampled upon by their own fellows in flight, but the multitude, overawed at the misfortune of those who were slain, was silent.¹

The same author shows that, besides these, countless other revolutions were stirred up in Jerusalem itself, indicating that revolts and wars and mutual machinations of evil never departed the city and all Judaea from that time until the time when, as the last episode of all, the siege under Vespasian came upon them. In this way, then, did the events of divine justice pursue the Jews for the crimes which they committed against Christ.

Chapter 7

We should not overlook that tradition holds that that Pilate himself, of our Saviour's time, fell into such misfortunes during the reign of Caius, whose times we are describing, that of necessity he became his own slayer and self-punishing avenger,¹ for, as it seems, divine vengeance overtook him in

1 Pilate met his doom as follows. A certain leader of the Samaritans agreed to disclose the sacred treasures which Moses was said to have concealed on Mt. Gerizim. When the Samaritans gathered there in large numbers, Pilate thought that a rebellion was in the making, and sent troops against them, who slew the Samaritans in great numbers. The Samaritans entered a complaint with the governor of Syria, Vitellius, who sent Pilate to Rome in A.D. 36 to answer the charges which had been brought against him. When Pilate reached Rome, he discovered that Tiberius had died and that Caius was on the throne. When Pilate was unable to defend himself, one tradition holds that he

no long while. Those of the Greeks who have written of the Olympiads, together with the events of each period, so relate.²

Chapter 8

Caius had held power for almost four complete years¹ when Claudius succeeded him as emperor.² When in his time famine³ oppressed the world (and this, also, writers with a purpose different from ours have handed down in their histories), the prediction of the prophet Agabus according to the Acts of the Apostles that a famine was to be upon the whole world received fulfillment. Luke, in the Acts, after calling attention to the famine under Claudius and relating how the brethren in Antioch, each according to his own ability, had dispatched to those in Judaea through Paul and Barnabas,⁴ goes on to say the following:

Chapter 9

‘At this time,’—obviously the time of Claudius,—‘Herod the king set hands on certain members of the Church to persecute them. He killed James the brother of John with

was banished to Vienne in Gaul, where a monument is still pointed out as his tomb. Another tradition declares that he committed suicide on the mountain near Lake Lucerne which still bears his name.

² Eusebius does not mention his authority here, and no extant records confirm this statement.

¹ From March 16, 37, to January 24, 41; he was succeeded by his uncle Claudius.

² Josephus, *A.J.* 19.201; *B.J.* 2.204. January 24, 41.

³ Eusebius seems to exaggerate the universal character of the famine, probably under the influence of Acts 11.28. But, see Tacitus, *Annal.* 12.13, and Cassius Dio 60.11.

⁴ Cf. Acts 11.29 and 30.

the sword.¹ Regarding this James, Clement, in Book 7 of his *Hypotyposes*,² relates a story worthy of mention, speaking according to a tradition of his predecessors, that he who brought him into court was so moved, on seeing him testify, that he confessed that he also was himself a Christian. 'So they were both led away together,' he says, 'and on the way he begged that he be forgiven by James. And James, having looked at him for a little while, said: "Peace be to you" and kissed him. And thus both were beheaded at the same time.' Then, as the divine Scripture says,³ when Herod saw that what had been done in the destruction of James was a source of pleasure to the Jews, he attacked Peter also, and, after putting him in prison, would have accomplished his death, had Peter not through divine intervention, when an angel stood over him in the night, unexpectedly been released from his bonds and set free for the ministry of preaching. Such a divine dispensation did the affairs of Peter enjoy.

Chapter 10

As for the king's attempt against the Apostles, there was no longer any delay, but at once the avenging minister of divine justice overtook him, immediately after his plot against the Apostles, as the Book of Acts relates.¹ When he had journeyed to Caesarea, there on a famous feast day,² clothed in brilliant

¹ Acts 12.1.2.

² On Clement's *Hypotyposes*, cf. below, 6.13. Eusebius is the sole authority for this fragment. This story is not entirely improbable, but we are inclined to believe that it arose through a confusion of this James with James the Just.

³ Cf. Acts 12.3-17.

¹ Cf. Acts 12.19.21-23.

² Probably the *Pro salute Caesaris*, celebrated every four years, and due in A.D. 44 when Herod probably died.

and royal garments and high before the tribunal, he addressed the people. And when all the people applauded over his address as over the voice of God and not of man, Scripture relates that straightway an angel of the Lord struck him and, becoming worm-eaten, he expired.³ The story of Josephus⁴ is worthy of wonder for its agreement in this marvel with the divine Scriptures, by which he clearly bears witness to the truth in Book 19 of his *Antiquities*, where the wonder is described in these very words:

'He had fulfilled the third year of his reign over all Judaea,⁵ and he had come to the city of Caesarea, which was formerly called Strato's Tower.⁶ There he was celebrating games in honor of Caesar, realizing that this was a kind of a feast for his safety,⁷ and for it there had gathered a multitude of those who had advanced to high offices and rank in the province. On the second day of the games he put on a robe made entirely of silver, so as to be a marvelous fabric, and went into the theatre at the beginning of day. Then, when the silver was struck by the first glint of the sun's rays, it shone marvelously, shedding a frightening and unusual gleam on those who gazed upon it. At once, from every side, his flatterers raised their voices for no good to him, calling him a god and saying further: "Be thou propitious; if up to now we have feared thee as a man, nevertheless, from now on we

3 Acts 12.23.

4 A.I. 19.343-351.

5 A.D. 44. Agrippa's rule over all the kingdom began in 41.

6 On the Mediterranean Sea, northwest of Jerusalem; a small town in Strabo's time, known as Strato's Tower. About 10 B.C., Herod the Great built the city of Caesarea here, which became the principal Roman city of Palestine, noted for its magnificence. An important Christian school was established in this Caesarea, and Eusebius himself became the city's bishop. Even during the Crusades it was an important city, but soon thereafter it became a scene of desolation.

7 Probably the *Quinquennalia*, established by Herod the Great in 12 B.C. in honor of Augustus and celebrated every five years. The occasion of this festival, however, is uncertain.

confess thee as of more than mortal nature." He did not rebuke them, nor did the king reject their impious flattery. But, after a little, he looked up and saw an angel sitting above his head.⁸ He immediately realized that it was a harbinger of evil, even as it had once been of good, and he felt a pain in his heart, and all at once pain beginning violently seized his stomach. So, looking up at his friends, he said, "I, the god to you, am now ordered to give up myself, for fate has at once rebuked the words which you recently falsely uttered about myself. I whom you called immortal am now being led away to die. I must accept the fate which God has willed. For we have lived by no means ingloriously, but in a happiness which men call happy." As he said this, he was being overwhelmed by the intensity of his pain. Thus he was speedily carried into the palace, and rumor spread among all that he would surely die in a little while. But the multitude, with their wives and children, seated upon sack cloth according to their ancestral custom, immediately began to beseech God for the king, and the whole place was filled with groans and lamentations.⁹ The king himself, as he lay in a high chamber and looked down upon them lying prostrate, did not remain tearless. After being racked by pain in the stomach for five successive days, he departed this life in the

8 Josephus, *AJ*. 18.195. Eusebius is usually very accurate in his quotations. Here, however, he departs from the text of Josephus, which says: 'He saw an owl sitting on a certain rope over his head, and immediately believed that it was a messenger (ángelos) of evil, as it before had been of good.' The reference is to the story as told by Josephus (*Ant*. 18.6.7) that when Agrippa was in chains, having been imprisoned by Tiberius, he saw an owl perched on a tree near him. A fellow prisoner interpreted this as a good omen, and so it turned out to be. Tiberius died in the next year, and the events as foretold came to pass. Some critics would excoriate Eusebius as wilfully misquoting here, but the passage may well have been badly handled in the manuscript by scribes.

9 Apparently, Agrippa had succeeded in winning the favor of the Jews. On the death of his grandfather, Herod the Great, a much different feeling was shown.

fifty-fourth year of his age and the seventh of his reign.¹⁰ For four years, then, he had reigned under Caius Caesar, three while ruling the tetrarchy of Philip, and in the fourth taking over that of Herod¹¹ as well, and for three years more he continued in the reign of Claudius Caesar.'

I marvel how Josephus confirms the truth of holy Scriptures in this and other matters. If there should seem to some to be a discrepancy as regards the name of the king, nevertheless the time at least and the events indicate that the person is the same, and either that the name was changed by a clerical error or even that there were two names¹² for the same man, as has happened with many.

Chapter 11

And again, since, Luke in the Acts¹ introduces Gamaliel as saying at the inquiry about the Apostles that at the time indicated Theudas rose up, claiming himself to be somebody—who was slain and all who obeyed him scattered—come, let us also compare the writing of Josephus regarding this man. Again in his work just mentioned he gives the following story:² 'When Fadus was procurator of Judaea,³ a

10 Born in 101 B.C., he began to reign as the successor of Philip and Lysanias in A.D. 37. As calculated here, the year is A.D. 44, which fits in well with other information, except that coins of Agrippa exist which refer to his eighth and ninth years. These coins, however, may well be spurious.

11 Herod Antipas.

12 It seems strange that Eusebius shows uncertainty here. In the heading of this Chapter he shows none. Luke calls the king by his family name, Herod; Josephus by his given name, Agrippa. He is known to us as Herod Agrippa I.

1 Acts 5.34-36.

2 Josephus, *A.J.* 20.97,98.

3 About A.D. 44.

certain imposter, Theudas⁴ by name, persuaded a very large multitude to take up their possessions and follow him to the River Jordan, for he said that he was a prophet and by his command would divide the river and furnish them an easy crossing, and in saying this he deceived many. Fadus, however, did not allow them to enjoy their folly, but sent a troop of horsemen against them, which, falling upon them unexpectedly, killed many and took many alive, and, capturing Theudas himself, cut off his head and brought it to Jerusalem.' After this, in turn, he recalls the famine that took place in the time of Claudius, as follows:⁵

Chapter 12

'And at this time¹ it happened that the great famine² took place in Judaea, during which Queen Helen³ bought grain at a great price from Egypt and distributed it among the needy.' You would find that this account also agrees with the writing of the Acts of the Apostles,⁴ which records that of the disciples in Antioch, 'each according to his means, determined

4 The Theudas mentioned by Josephus was of the time of Claudius. The Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel in the Acts must have lived many years before. The two cannot be identified. Again, in spite of some critics, Eusebius is probably guilty here of nothing more than carelessness.

5 Josephus, *A.J.* 20.101.

1 In the times of the procurators Cuspius Fodus and Tiberius Alexander. Already mentioned by Josephus in *Ant.* 20.2.

3 This Helen was the wife of King Monabazus of Adiabene, and the mother of Izates, his successor. Both mother and son were converted to the Jewish religion and, when they came to Jerusalem by chance at the time of the famine, did much to relieve the distress occasioned by it. When mother and son died, their remains were brought to Jerusalem and buried just outside the walls, where Helen had erected three pyramids. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 20.2; 20.4.3.

4 Cf. Acts 11.29,30, where we find Saul rather than Paul, a natural slip on the part of Eusebius.

to send relief to the brethren dwelling in Judaea. And this they did, sending it to the presbyters by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.⁷ Splendid monuments⁵ of the Helen of whom the historian has made mention are to this day shown in the suburbs of the city now called Aelia,⁶ and she was said to have been queen of the nation of the Adiabeni.⁷

Chapter 13

As the faith in our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ was now being spread among all men,¹ the Enemy of man's salvation contrived to seize the imperial city in advance and conducted there Simon² who has been mentioned before, and presently,

5 Both Pausanias (*In Arcadicis*) and Jerome testify to the existence of these great monuments.

6 Hadrian so named Jerusalem; cf. below, 4.6.

7 The land of the Adiabeni, Adiabene, was a small territory lying between the Tigris, Lycus, and the Gordiaean Mountains. This is not to be confused with the wider sense of name as applied to Assyria in general by some ancient writers.

1 See Ch. 3 n 1. It might be well to remark here that the most unsatisfactory portion of Eusebius's *History* is that treating of heresies. Eusebius himself has been blamed severely for this by some critics. It seems, however, to be due rather to the age in which he lived. All Christians at this time regarded heretics as tools of the Devil. Consequently, their works were excluded from all Christian libraries. Christians received their information about heretics not from the writings of the heretics themselves but from those who took it upon themselves to refute them; in other words, from their avowed enemies. Eusebius was no different from the other Christians of his time, and perhaps not greatly so from the Christians of our own time.

2 Simon Magus, first mentioned in Acts 8.9; cf. also, 2.1, above. He played a very important part in early Church history, but it is difficult to unravel fiction from fact in any account of his activities. One thing seems certain—he is not to be identified with St. Paul. The stories of the third century are based upon a real historical person, whose existence accounts for the early notices of him in the Acts and in Justin Martyr; also in the tradition of all parties in the Church. Some would disassociate the Simon of the Acts and the Simon of later writings.

by aiding his treacherous sorcery, won over to error for himself many of the inhabitants of Rome. This was made clear by Justin, who was pre-eminent in our teachings not long after the Apostles, and about whom I shall present what is fitting in due course.³ In his first *Apology* to Antoninus for our doctrine he writes in these words:⁴ 'And after the Ascension of the Lord into heaven the demons pushed forward certain men who said that they were gods, and these not only were not persecuted by you but were even deemed worthy of honors; for example, a certain Simon, a Samaritan, from a village called Gittho,⁵ who in the time of Claudius Caesar,⁶ having performed mighty deeds of magic by the art of the demons working in him, was considered a god in your capital city, Rome, and was honored by you with a statue as a god on the River Tiber between the two bridges,⁷ with this inscription in Latin, *Simoni Deo Sancto*,⁸ that is, to Simon a holy god. 'And almost all the Samaritans, and a few among other nations also, confess and worship that man as their first god. And they call a certain Helena, who traveled about with him at that time and who had formerly lived in a brothel' in Tyre of Phœnicia, 'the first Idea from him.'⁹

³ Cf. below, 4.8,11,16-18.

⁴ Justin, *Apology* 1.26,56.

⁵ A village of Samaria, near Flavia Neapolis, modern Nablus, identified with the present village of Kuryet Jit.

⁶ Justin places Simon's visit to Rome in the reign of Claudius, A.D. 41-54. Irenaeus also does this. Others, however, assign it to the reign of Nero. All differ as to how he met his death. The one agreement is on his having visited Rome at one time or another.

⁷ I.e., on the island in the middle of the Tiber, just below the Vatican. It now bears the name of Isola Tiberiana or Isola di S. Sebastiano.

⁸ A statue was found in 1574 on the Island of St. Sebastian. It bears the inscription *Semoni Sanco Deo, to the god Semo Sancus*. But Semo Sancus was an old Sabine divinity, and not to be identified with Simon, the Samaritan sorcerer.

⁹ Cf. Irenaeus 1.23.2; Hippolytus 6.15; Tertullian, *De anima* 34;

All this does Justin say, and Irenaeus¹⁰ also agrees with him in the first of his books against heresies as he describes at once the man's activities and his profane and foul teaching. It would be superfluous to describe this in the present work, since those who wish can study in detail the beginnings and the lives and the bases of the false doctrines of the heresiarchs who followed him, as well as the customs introduced by all of them, as they have been carefully handed down in the above-mentioned book of Irenaeus. So we have accepted by tradition that Simon was the first author of all heresy. From him and down to the present those who enter upon his heresy, feigning the philosophy of Christians, sober and famous among all for its purity of life, they nonetheless take up again the idolatrous superstition from which they thought to be freed, falling down before pictures and images of Simon himself and of Helena mentioned above with him, venturing to worship them with incense and sacrifices and libations. And their more secret rites, of which it is said that he who first hears them will be astonished and according to a written expression current among them will be made to marvel, are truly full of marvel and frenzy and madness, for they are such that not only can they not be committed to writing but, because of their excessive obscenity and unspeakable conduct, cannot be mentioned by the lips of decent men. For, whatever might be conceived as more foul than all baseness, all this the utter abomination of the heresy of these

Epiphanius, *Haer.* 21; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* 1; and Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 5.62. All give similar accounts of Helen. Moreover, as recorded by these ancient writers, Simon's doctrines and practices show a crude and undeveloped form of Gnosticism. This conception of the 'Idea' plays an important part in all Gnostic systems. Most of the systems had two original elements, 'Potentiality' and 'Idea,' from a union of which all beings came.

10 *Adv. haer.* 1.23,1-4.

men has outdone, who make sport of wretched women truly weighed down with every kind of evil.¹¹

Chapter 14

As the father and contriver of such evils, the evil Power that hates good and plots against men's salvation raised up Simon at that time, as it were a great antagonist of the great and inspired Apostles of our Saviour. Nevertheless, that divine and heavenly grace that co-operates with its dispensers, by their appearance and presence, quickly extinguished the enkindled flame of evil, through them humbling and casting down 'every lofty thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God.'¹ Wherefore, no conspiracy, either of Simon or of anyone else who arose at that time, succeeded in these apostolic days. For the light of truth and the divine Word itself, which recently had shone upon men from God and was flourishing upon earth and dwelling within in His own Apostles, was conquering and subduing all things. Straightway, the above-named sorcerer,² as if struck in the eyes of his mind by a divine and marvelous flesh when formerly in Judaea³ he had been detected for his evil deeds by the

11 Cf. 2 Tim. 3.6. The Simonians were truly very immoral and licentious, as were other Gnostic sects such as the Ophites and the Carpocratians, but many, such as Marcion, Saturninus, and Tatian went to the other extreme, teaching a very strict asceticism. They both arose from a dualism of matter and spirit, body and soul, the former a work of the Devil and so to be despised and abused, the latter to be honored above all. The two extremes resulted according to the character and instincts of the persons concerned. The Fathers hated all heretics and so accused them all indiscriminately of the worst immorality.

1 2 Cor. 10.5.

2 Acts 8.18-23.

3 Judaea is here being used in a wide sense, meaning the province of

Apostle Peter, set out on a very long journey overseas from east to west and went off in flight, thinking that only in this way could he live according to his wish. And when he came to the city of the Romans,⁴ the power that obsessed him co-operated with him greatly and in short time he was so successful in his undertakings that he was honored as a god by the erection of a statue⁵ by those in this city. However, his affairs did not prosper for long. Close upon him in the same reign of Claudius, the all-good and kindly Providence of the universe guided Peter, the great and mighty one of the Apostles, because of his virtue the spokesman for all the others, to Rome, as if against a great corrupter of life. And he,⁶ like a noble general of God, clad in divine armor, conveys the costly merchandise of the light⁷ from the east to those in the west, preaching the light itself and the Word which saves souls, the proclamation of the Kingdom of Heaven.⁸

Chapter 15

Thus, then, when the divine Word had made its home among them,¹ the power of Simon was extinguished and straightway perished with the man also. And so great a light of religion shone upon the minds of the hearers of Peter

Judaea, including Samaria.

4 Rome with its opportunities for propagandizing was a great gathering place for heretics and schismatics. Eusebius naturally considers it the special city of the Devil.

5 Cf. above, 2.13.

6 Cf. Eph. 6.14-11; 1 Thess. 5.8.

7 Cf. John 1.9.

8 We have here an excellent illustration of Eusebius' rhetorical style.

1 Eusebius gives the story of the origin of the Church in Rome as it is accepted by the Catholic Church. Certain modern historians, however, strongly oppose this account, although offering nothing at all tangible in its place.

that they were not satisfied with merely a single hearing or with the unwritten teaching of the divine Gospel, but with all sorts of entreaties they besought Mark,² who was a follower of Peter and whose Gospel is extant, to leave behind with them in writing a record of the teaching passed on to them orally; and they did not cease until they had prevailed upon the man and so became responsible for the Scripture which is called the Gospel according to Mark.³ And they say that the Apostle, knowing what had been done, since the Spirit had revealed it to him, rejoiced at the zeal of the men and authorized the Scripture for reading in the churches. Clement has quoted the story in Book 6 of the *Hypotyposes*, and the Bishop of Hierapolis, Papias⁴ by name, confirms him, saying that Peter mentions Mark in his first Epistle, which they say he composed in Rome itself; and they say that he himself indicates this by referring to the city metaphorically as Babylon in these words: 'the church which is at Babylon, chosen together with you, greets you; and so does my son Mark.'⁵

Chapter 16

They say that this Mark, having set forth, was the first to preach in Egypt the Gospel which he had also composed and

2 John Mark, son of Mary, a sister of Barnabas; cf. Acts 12.12; Col. 4.10. He went with Paul and Barnabas on their missionary journeys; cf. Acts 15.39; Col. 4.10; and Phil. 24. He was with Peter when he wrote his first epistle; cf. 1 Peter 5.13.

3 The universal tradition of antiquity is that Mark wrote the second Gospel as a record of what he had heard from Peter, and so directly under his influence.

4 On Papias, cf. below, 3.39.

5 1 Peter 5.13. This interpretation as given by Eusebius is that of the Fathers and the Catholic Church. Some Protestant scholars insist on the literal use of the word 'Babylon.'

was the first to establish churches in Alexandria¹ itself. Indeed, so great was the multitude of both men and women who received the faith there at the first attempt by means of a most philosophic and vehement asceticism that Philo thought it fitting to describe their ways of life and assemblies and meals and all the rest of their manner of living.²

Chapter 17

Tradition also holds that this Philo came in the time of Claudius to a meeting with Peter in Rome, who was then preaching to people there.¹ This, indeed, would not be improbable, since the very work which we mention, composed by him some time later, clearly includes those canons of the Church which have been observed even to the present day among us. Moreover, since he records in the greatest possible detail the life of the ascetics of our time, it should be clear that he not only knew but also accepted and revered and extolled the apostolic men of his day, who, as it appears, were of the Hebrew race and so still observed in a strictly Jewish manner most of the ancient customs. First of all,² after promising in

1 Several ancient writers attest to Mark's labors in Egypt, e.g., Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51.6), Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 8), Necephorus (*H.E.* 2.43), and the *Acta Barnabae*. From Eusebius' use of 'they say,' he appears to be following oral tradition here. In 2.24 Eusebius says that Annianus succeeded Mark as a leader of the Alexandrian Church in the eighth year of Nero, i.e., 62. This implies that Mark died in that year which is the date of his death as given by Jerome. But this involves us in difficulties of chronology. Except for the information given us in the New Testament, Mark's entire career is quite obscure.

2 See Ch. 17.

1 This tradition that Philo became acquainted with Peter in Rome is repeated by Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 11), and Photius (*God.* 105) even adds that the great Jewish philosopher became a Christian. It appears certain, however, that Philo never became a Christian, and there is no dependable evidence that Peter and Philo ever met.

2 Philo 471.6.7.

the work which he had entitled *On a Contemplative Life, or on Suppliants*³ that he would add nothing at all beyond the truth and of his own invention to what he was about to relate, he says that they are called Therapeutae⁴ and the women with them Therapeutrides, giving in addition the reasons for such a name, either in accord with the fact that by relieving the souls of those who came to them of their evil passions they cured and healed them like physicians, or because of their pure and genuine worship and service of God. Now, whether he gave them this name of his own accord, naturally adapting the name to the manner of living of the men, or the first of them really called themselves this in the beginning, since the name of Christian had not yet come into use everywhere,⁵ we need not yet discuss at length. At any rate, then, he bears witness first of all to their abandonment of property, stating⁶ that when they begin to follow philosophy they give up their property to their relatives, and then, after bidding farewell to all the cares of life, go outside the walls and dwell in lonely fields and gardens, knowing well that intermingling with people of another way of life is unprofitable and harmful, since those who did this at that time, as it seems, practiced the emulation of the life of the Prophets with a zealous and very ardent faith. For, even in the canonical Acts of the Apostles⁷ it is recorded that all the companions of the Apostles sold all their property and possessions and distributed them among all,⁸

3 Philo 471.15-472.3. Eusebius was quite right in identifying the Therapeutae with the Christian monks of his own day. He was wrong in accepting Philo as the author of this work, which was probably written in the latter part of the third century, and in assuming that monasticism as he knew it existed in the apostolic age.

4 Therapeutae and Therapeutrides, 'worshippers' or 'physicians', from the verb *therapeuo*, 'to do service to the gods' or 'to tend the sick.'

5 Philo 473.18-22.

6 Philo 474.17-34. Cf. below, 6.3.

7 Acts 2.45. Cf. below, 3.4.

8 Acts 4.34-35.

according as anyone had need, so that no one among them was in want; thus, as many as were possessors of lands and houses, as the account says, sold them and brought the price of what they sold and laid it at the feet of the Apostles so as to distribute it to each, according as anyone had need.

Philo bears witness to practices very much like these which are being described and then continues, using these very words:⁹ 'Now, the race¹⁰ is in many places in the world, for it was proper that both Greece and barbarism share in perfect good, but it abounds in Egypt in each of the so-called names,¹¹ especially around Alexandria. The noblest from everywhere, as if to the fatherland of the Therapeutae, send a colony to a very fitting place which is above Lake Marsia,¹² located on a rather low hill, very convenient for its safety and the mildness of climate.' Then, in turn, after describing the nature of the houses that they have, he speaks as follows about the churches throughout the land: 'In each house there is a sacred chamber which is called "a sanctuary and monastery," in which in isolation they perform the mysteries of the holy life, bringing nothing into it, either drink or food or anything else that is necessary for the needs of the body, but laws and inspired oracles of the Prophets and hymns by which knowledge and piety are increased and made perfect.'¹³

And after other matters, he says: 'The entire period intervening between dawn and evening is for them a religious exercise. They read the sacred Scriptures and explain the philosophy of their fathers by allegory, for they regard the words of the literal interpretation as symbolic of a concealed

9 Philo 474.35-44.

10 I.e., the Therapeutae.

11 Land districts, Egypt, exclusive of the cities Alexandria and Ptolemais, was divided into thirty-six such districts or *nomoi*. The number varied later.

12 More commonly called Lake Mareotis, in the northern part of the Delta, a little south of Alexandria.

13 Philo 475.14-22.

nature made clear in what is beneath the surface. 'They also have writings of ancient men, who were the founders of their sect and left many memorials of the meaning in allegorical terms, by using which as models they imitate the manner of their way of life.'¹⁴

These things seem to have been said by a man who listened to them as they expounded the sacred Scriptures, and it is perhaps probable that the writings of the ancients which he says were in their possession were the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles and certain interpretive narrations in the manner of the ancient Prophets, such as the Epistle to the Hebrews and many others of St. Paul included. Then, again, in turn he writes thus about their composing new psalms: 'So that they not only contemplate but also compose songs and hymns to God in all kinds of metres and melodies, although of necessity arranging them in the more sacred measures.'¹⁵

He discusses many other matters, also, with which our study deals, but it seemed that of necessity I should enumerate those by which the characteristics of the Church's way of life are set forth. But, if it seems to anyone that what has been said is not characteristic of life according to the Gospel, but can be applied to others besides those indicated, let him be persuaded by Philo's words further on, in which he will obtain, if he be fair, undisputed testimony on this point. He writes as follows: 'They lay down for the soul continence as a foundation and build the other virtues upon it. No one of them would take food or drink before the setting of the sun, for they think that philosophizing belongs to daylight and the necessities of the body to darkness; and so they allot day to the one, and a small part of the night to the others. Some, also, in whom dwells a great love of knowledge, overlook

¹⁴ Philo 475.34-476.2.

¹⁵ Philo 476.2-5.

bodily nourishment for three days, and some so delight and fare so sumptuously at the banquet of doctrines, provided so richly and without stint by wisdom, that they abstain for twice the time, having become accustomed scarcely to taste necessary nourishment every six days.¹⁶

We believe that these statements of Philo, clear and irrefutable, have reference to those of our communion. If, after this, anyone should still stubbornly deny it, let this person cease from his incredulity, giving way to clearer proofs which cannot be discovered among any except only among the religion of Christians according to the Gospel. For he says¹⁷ that women also are among those about whom we speak, most of whom are aged virgins¹⁸ who preserved their chastity not by compulsion as some of the priestesses among the Greeks, but rather by a voluntary purpose; through a zeal and a desire for wisdom by reason of their longing to live with this wisdom they disregarded the pleasures of the body, longing not for mortal but immortal offspring, which only the soul in love with God can bear of itself. Then, a little farther on in the text, he sets forth the following more emphatically: 'The interpretations of the sacred Scriptures are made among them figuratively in allegories. For the whole law seems to these men to be like a living thing and to have as a body the spoken precepts and as a soul the unseen sense lying within the words, which this sect has begun especially to contemplate, for as through a mirror of words it beheld the surpassing beauties of thoughts.'¹⁹

Why besides this should we mention their gatherings to-

16 Philo 476.36-39.

17 Philo 482.3-11.

18 Philo, of course, lived and wrote during the reign of Claudius. Christianity at that time was scarcely well enough established to admit of virgins growing old in the Church. But this is just another example of Eusebius' carelessness in matters of chronology.

19 Philo 483.42-484.1.

gether,²⁰ how the men live separately and the woman separately in the same place, and their customary religious practices which are observed by us even today,²¹ especially those which we are accustomed to observe at the feast of the Saviour's Passion with fasting and vigils and attention to the divine Word? The author mentioned has handed down all this in his own writing,²² indicating in detail the very mode of life which has been observed by us alone even to the present time, describing the all-night vigils of the great feast, and the exercises in connection with them, and the hymns customarily recited by us,²³ and how, while one sings regularly with cadence, the others listen in silence and join in singing only the refrain of the hymns,²⁴ and how on the days mentioned they sleep on straw on the ground, and, as he expressly wrote, refrain entirely from wine and any kind of flesh, but water is their only drink, and the relish with their bread is salt and hyssop. In addition to this he describes²⁵ the manner of precedence of those who have been entrusted with the services of the Church, and with the deaconships, and with the high places of the episcopate at the head of all.²⁶ Whoever has a desire for a detailed description of these things could acquire it from the account of the man already quoted. It is clear to everyone that Philo wrote all this having in mind the first heralds of the teaching according to the Gospel and the customs handed down from the beginning by the Apostles.

20 Philo 476.23-24.

21 Philo 481.22-24.

22 Philo 484.33-34.

23 Philo 484.10-21.

24 Philo 482.18-21; 483.4-10.

25 Philo 481.32-34.42; 482.3.24.25; 483.17; 484.6.

26 Eusebius is probably right in finding in the young men who serve at table (*diakonountes*), and in a president (*prœedros*) who directs the study of Scripture, deacons and bishops respectively. The author of the *De vita contemplativa* makes mention of them, also.

Chapter 18

Being copious in language and comprehensive in his thinking, and having become sublime in his views upon divine Scripture, Philo has made his exposition of the sacred word various and diverse.¹ On the one hand, he described in regular succession the material of the events in Genesis, to which he gave the title *The Allegories of the Sacred Laws*. On the other hand, he has made detailed divisions of the chapters under investigation in the Scriptures with observations and solutions in the books to which he appropriately gives the title of *The Questions and Solutions in Genesis and in Exodus*. Besides, these treatises have been elaborately worked out by him on certain problems, such as the two books *On Agriculture* and the same number *On Drunkenness*, and some others deemed worthy of different and appropriate titles, such as *Concerning the Things Which the Sober Mind Desires and Execrates*, *On the Confusion of Tongues*, *On Flight and Discovery*, *On Assembly for Instruction*, *On the Question: Who Is Heir to the Divine Things*, or *On the Distinction between Odd and Even*, and again *On the Three Virtues Which Moses Described with Others*, in addition to these, *On Those Whose Names Have Been Changed and Why They Were*, in which he says that he also composed Books 1 and 2 *On Covenants*.² His is also a work *On Emigration and the Wise Life of the Man Initiated into Righteousness*, or *On Unwritten Laws*, and also *On Giants or the Immutability of God*, and Books 1-5 of *On the Proposition that according to*

1 On Philo's life, cf. above, 2.4-6. Eusebius makes extensive use of Philo's works in his *Praep. evang.*, and in so doing preserves many fragments that would otherwise have been lost.

2 Philo, *De mut. nom.* 53.

Moses Dreams Are Sent by God. These are the books which have come down to us of those dealing with Genesis. But on Exodus we know Books 1-5 of his *Questions and Solutions*, the books *On the Tabernacle*, and that *On the Ten Commandments*, and Books 1-4 of *On the Laws Which Refer Especially to the Principal Divisions of the Ten Commandments*, and the book *On Animals for Sacrifice and What the Kinds of Sacrifice Are*, and the book *On the Rewards Fixed in the Law for the Good and the Penalties and Curses for the Wicked*. Besides all these, some single volumes also are extant; for example, that *On Providence*, and the treatise he composed *On the Jews*, and *The Statesman*; also, *Alexander* or *On the Proposition that Irrational Animals Have Reason*. Besides these there is *On the Proposition that Every Wicked Man Is a Slave*, to which is appended *On the Proposition that Every Good Man Is Free*; after which he composed the work *On the Contemplative Life or Suppliants*, from which we have quoted the passages on the life of the apostolic men; and *The Interpretations of the Hebrew Names in the Law and Prophets* is said to be a work of the same author. This man came to Rome in the time of Gaius, and in the time of Claudius³ he is said to have read before the whole Senate of the Romans a work written by him on the impiety of Caius, which with characteristic irony he entitled *On Virtues*, and his words were so much admired that they were deemed worthy of a place in libraries.

In these times, while Paul was finishing his journey 'from Jerusalem round about as far as unto Illyricum,'⁴ Claudius

³ It is quite unlikely that Philo was in Rome during the reign of Claudius. In any event, it is difficult to believe that anyone, and especially a Jew, would have been permitted to read before the Roman Senate a work full of hatred against the Romans and containing derogatory allusions to the Emperor Caligula.

⁴ Cf. Rom. 15.19.

drove the Jews out of Rome; and Aquila and Priscilla, with the other Jews, on being banished from Rome came into Asia, and there they lived with Paul the Apostle, who was strengthening the foundations of the churches recently laid there by him. The sacred writing of the Acts also teaches this.⁵

Chapter 19

While Claudius¹ was still managing the affairs of the Empire, it happened at the feast of the Passover that so great a riot and confusion took place in Jerusalem that of those Jews alone who were forcibly crowded together about the exits of the Temple 30,000 perished by being trampled by one another, and the feast became an occasion of mourning for the whole nation and of lamentation in every house. This, too, is the account of Josephus² word for word. Claudius appointed Agrippa,³ son of Agrippa, as King of the Jews, and sent

⁵ Cf. Acts 18.2,18,19,23.

¹ Cf. *B.I.* 2.227; *Antiq.* 20.5.3. This disturbance took place in A.D. 48, during the procuratorship of Cumanus. Although the ancient authorities differ as to this date, the weight of the evidence favors Eusebius.

² *B.I.* 2.247,248.

³ Herod Agrippa II, son of Herod Agrippa I. When his father died in A.D. 44, he was only seventeen years old. Because of his youth, Claudius refused to give him his father's kingdom, but converted it into a Roman province and appointed Fadus its procurator. In 49, however, Agrippa was granted the kingdom of Chalcis which had belonged to his uncle Herod, brother of Herod Agrippa I. In 53, he was assigned to the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias with the title of 'God.' Since Judaea always remained a Roman province throughout his reign, he never became its king as his father had been. His territory consisted only of the northeastern part of Palestine. However, he did have the right of appointing and removing the high priests. Furthermore, under Nero his domain was increased by the addition of several cities in Galilee and Peraea. Since he co-operated with the Romans in the Jewish War, he afterwards went to Rome, where he died in 100. He was the last prince of the Herodian family. St. Paul made his defense, as recorded in Acts 26, under this Agrippa.

out Felix⁴ as Procurator of the whole country of Samaria and Galilee and so-called Peraea, besides.⁵ After Claudius himself had administered the government thirteen years and eight months⁶ he died, leaving Nero as his successor to the throne.

Chapter 20

In the reign of Nero, while Felix was Procurator of Judaea, Josephus again describes in Book 20 of the *Antiquities* the quarrel of the priests with one another as follows, in these very words:¹ 'Now a quarrel arose between the high priests and the priests and the leaders of the people of Jerusalem,² and each of them, having formed for himself a body of the boldest and most revolutionary, became their leader, and whenever they met they used to abuse and throw stones at each other. There was no one at all to rebuke them, but as in a city without government these things were done with arrogance. So great a shamelessness and audacity seized the high priests that they dared to send forth their slaves to the threshing floors to seize the tithes that were due the priests. And it was a common occurrence to see those priests who were destitute perish of want. Thus the force of the members of the factions overcame all justice.'

And again the same author relates that at the same time

4 A freedman of Claudius who succeeded Cumanus as procurator of Judaea in A.D. 52. Josephus (*B.J.* 2.13.2.) declares that the territory over which he ruled included Samaria, most of Galilee, and Peraea. To this Nero added Judaea.

5 Cf. Joseph. *Ant.* 20.8,11,9; also 9.1.4,6,7. Although Eusebius believed the Roman province to include only Samaria, Galilee, and Peraea, it included Judaea also.

6 Claudius' rule extended from January 24, 41, to October 13, 54.

1 *A.J.* 20.180,181. Felix was persistently mean and cruel, and thus created disturbances throughout his procuratorship.

2 No cause is given for this quarrel which arose toward the end of Felix's term, under the high priest Ishmael.

there arose in Jerusalem a certain kind of bandits³ who by day, as he says, and in the middle of the city murdered whom-ever they met. Especially at feasts they mingled with the throng and, concealing short daggers in their clothes, they used to stab the distinguished persons with them; then when they fell, the very ones who committed the murders joined those who were expressing indignation. Thus, because of the confidence generally placed in them, they remained undiscovered. The first to be slain by them was Jonathan⁴ the high priest, and after him many were destroyed daily, and the fear became worse than the disasters, as each one, as if in battle, hourly expected death.

Chapter 21

After other matters in addition to these, he continues as follows:¹ 'The Egyptian false prophet² afflicted the Jews with a greater plague than these. For, the man coming to the

³ Josephus, *B.I.* 2.254-256. Open robberies and murders, common in Jerusalem at this time, were for the most part due to the conduct of Felix himself. Felix arranged for the murder of Jonathan the high priest (see next note), and this set the example for the conduct of the many ruffians then in Jerusalem.

⁴ Jonathan had been on very intimate terms with Felix. In fact he had used his influence to effect the appointment of Felix as procurator. But he took the liberty of advising and rebuking Felix as he wished, and thus became such a burden that Felix arranged his death. Felix bribed a trusted friend of Jonathan to undertake the job of introducing a band of ruffians into the city. These, being unknown in Jerusalem, mingled freely with the people and murdered Jonathan and many others. The wholesale slaughter was planned in order to divert attention from the real purpose of the plan. Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* 20.8.5.

¹ Josephus, *B.I.* 2.261-263.

² One of the many magicians and false prophets of the age, an Egyptian Jew, who prophesied that God would destroy Jerusalem because of its paganism by throwing down its walls as He had those of Jericho. He and his followers, as the true Israel and army of God, would await on the Mount of Olives, and attack as the walls fell.

land as a sorcerer and securing for himself the faith due a prophet, he gathered about 30,000 of those whom he had deceived, and leading them about from the desert to the so-called Mount of Olives he could from there have made his way into Jerusalem by force, overpowering the Roman garrison and the people by making tyrannical use of the soldiers who had fallen in with him. But Felix anticipated his attack, going out to meet him with the Roman soldiers, and all the people joined in the defense, so that when the meeting took place the Egyptian fled with a few followers, but most of those with him were either destroyed or captured alive.'

Josephus describes these events in Book 2 of the *Wars*.³ But it is worth checking what has been pointed out here about the Egyptian with the account in the Acts of the Apostles, where,⁴ in the time of Felix, the centurion in Jerusalem said to Paul, when the multitude of the Jews rose up against him: 'Art not thou that Egyptian who before these days didst raise a tumult, and didst lead forth into the desert four thousand men that were murderers?'⁵ Such are the events that took place in the time of Felix.

Chapter 22

Festus¹ was sent by Nero as the successor of this man.

³ Josephus gives another account of this episode in *Antiq.* 20.8.6. These two accounts are in virtual agreement, differing only in details.

⁴ Acts 21.38.

⁵ These murderers were called Sicarii from the short dagger or *sica* which they very conveniently concealed in the sleeve. They were a special group of revolutionaries in Jerusalem ever ready to assassinate their opponents.

¹ In great contrast to his predecessor, Festus seems to have been a just and capable governor. He died while in office, but must have ruled for at least a year. The exact year of his accession is unknown but it is certain that he died before the summer of 62. Cf. Josephus, *B.I.*

Under him, Paul was tried and was taken a prisoner to Rome.² Aristarchus was with him³ whom he quite naturally calls his fellow prisoner somewhere in the Epistles. And Luke, who has handed down the Acts of the Apostles in writing,⁴ brought his story to a close at this point, pointing out that Paul spent two whole years in Rome in freedom, and preached the word of God without hindrance.⁵ Story has it that the Apostle, after defending himself, was again sent upon the ministry of preaching, and coming a second time⁶ to the same city met death by martyrdom under Nero. While he was being held in prison, he composed the second Epistle to Timothy, at the same time indicating that his first defense had taken place and that his martyrdom was at hand. Accept, now, his testimony on these matters. He says, 'At my first answer, no one was with me, but all forsook me: may it not be laid to their charge. But the Lord stood by me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching may be accomplished, and that all the Gentiles may hear: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.'⁷ He plainly proves by these words that on the first occasion, in order that the preaching that was done through him might be fulfilled, he was delivered out of the mouth of the lion, referring, as it

2 Cf. Acts 25.8-12; 27.1. If Festus became procurator in 61, this must have been the year when Paul was sent as a prisoner to Rome. He probably was sent there in the autumn and arrived there in the spring of that same year.

3 Cf. Col. 4.10.

4 Cf. below, 3.4.

5 Cf. Acts 28.30,31.

6 Eusebius is the first to record the tradition of a second imprisonment for Paul in Rome. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 5) and later writers follow him. Some modern critics scoff at the idea of a second imprisonment, although there is no evidence of any kind against it. As to what Paul did in the interim, some of those who believe in the second imprisonment assume simply a journey to the Orient; others assume also a journey to Spain. The visit to Spain seems very unlikely, especially since there is a complete absence of all evidence, through tradition or otherwise, for such a journey.

7 2 Tim. 4.16,17.

seems, to Nero by this, because of his savage cruelty. He did not add next something like 'He will deliver me out of the mouth of the lion,' for he saw in the spirit that his death was all but at hand; wherefore, adding to the words 'And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion,' he says: 'The Lord will deliver me from every evil work: and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom,'⁸ indicating his speedy martyrdom, which he foretells even more clearly in the same writing, when he says, 'For I am even now ready to be sacrificed: and the time of my dissolution is at hand.'⁹ Now, in the second Epistle of those to Timothy, he shows¹⁰ that Luke alone was with him as he wrote, but at his first answer not even this one; wherefore, Luke probably wrote the Acts of the Apostles at that time, bringing the narrative up to the time when he was with Paul. We have related these matters to show that Paul's martyrdom was not accomplished by him during the sojourn in Rome which Luke records. Probably in the beginning, when Nero was more kindly disposed, Paul's answer for his doctrine was more easily received, but as he went on to lawless deeds of crime the Apostles along with the rest were objects of his attacks.¹¹

Chapter 23

When Paul appealed to Caesar¹ and was sent over to the city of the Romans by Festus,² the Jews, being disappointed in

⁸ Cf. 2 Tim. 4.18.

⁹ 2 Tim. 4.6.

¹⁰ Cf. 2 Tim. 4.11,16.

¹¹ It is true that Nero became extremely cruel and tyrannical in the latter part of his reign. The famous 'first five years' of clemency and justice were past before Paul came to Rome. Eusebius' explanation of Nero's change of character may or may not be true.

¹ Cf. Acts 25.11,12; 27.1.

² Cf. Acts 23.13-15; 25.3.

the hope with which they prepared their plot for him, turned against James, the brother of the Lord,³ to whom the throne of the episcopacy in Jerusalem had been entrusted by the Apostles.⁴ The following daring measures against him were undertaken by them. Bringing him into their midst, they demanded of him a denial of the faith in Christ in the presence of all the people, but when, contrary to the opinion of all, he spoke up with a clear voice and with greater courage than they had expected and confessed before all the people that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is the Son of God, they were no longer able to endure the testimony of the man because he was believed by all on account of the height which he had attained in his life of philosophy and religion to be most righteous, and they killed him, seizing upon anarchy as an opportunity for power, since at that very moment Festus had died in Judaea and the affairs of government there were without a head or procurator. The manner of James' death had already been shown by the words of Clement already quoted, who has related that he was thrown from the turret and beaten to death with a club.⁵ Hegesippus,⁶ however, who belonged to the first generation after the Apostles, gives the most accurate account of him in Book 5 of his *Memoirs*, speaking in this manner: 'The government of the Church passed to James, the brother of the Lord, together with the Apostles.'⁷ He was called the "Just" by all from the time of the Lord even to our own, since many were called James, but this man was holy from his mother's womb.⁸ He drank no

3 Cf. above, 1.12.

4 Cf. above, 2.1.

5 *Ibid.*

6 Cf. below, 4.22.

7 This statement by Hegesippus is probably correct. James was with Peter and John as a leader in the Church of Jerusalem. This is quite different from saying, as Eusebius does, that he was appointed Bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles.

8 Cf. Lev. 10.9; Num. 6.3; Luke 1.15.

wine nor strong drink, nor did he eat flesh; no razor passed over his head;⁹ he did not anoint himself with oil, and he did not use the bath. To this man alone was it permitted to enter the sanctuary, for he did not wear wool, but linen. He used to enter the Temple alone, and be found resting on his knees and praying for forgiveness for the people,¹⁰ so that his knees became as hard as those of a camel because of his constant bending forward on his knees in worshipping God and begging for forgiveness for the people. Because of his excessive righteousness he was called the Just and Oblias, which in Greek is "Bulwark of the people" and "Righteousness," as the prophets disclose about him.¹¹ So, some of the seven sects among the people, which I have already described in the *Memoirs*,¹² asked of him what is the "door of Jesus,"¹³ and he said that this was the Saviour. Because of these words some believed that Jesus was the Christ. But the sects mentioned previously did not believe in a resurrection or in one coming to mete out to each according to his works, but as many as did believe did so because of James. So, since many even of the rulers believed there was a commotion among the Jews and the Scribes and the Pharisees, who said that the whole people was in danger of looking for Jesus as the Christ, they therefore came together and said to James: "We beg you, restrain the people, for they have strayed to Jesus, as though He were the Christ. We beg you to persuade concerning Jesus all who have come for the day of the Passover, for we all obey you. For we and all the people testify to you¹⁴ that you are righteous and that you do not respect persons."¹⁵ Therefore, persuade the mul-

9 Cf. Num. 6.5.

10 This dramatic account of James by Hegesippus is greatly overdrawn.

This is quite a different James from the one that we find in the Bible.

11 The reference here is very vague. It may possibly be to Isa. 3.10.

12 Cf. below, 4.22.7.

13 Cf. John 10.9.

14 Cf. Luke 20.21.

15 Cf. Matt. 22.16.

titude not to be led astray regarding Jesus, for all the people and all of us obey you. So, stand upon the turret of the Temple that you may be visible on high and your words may be easily heard by all the people, for because of the Passover all the tribes, with the Gentiles also, have come together." Thus, the afore-mentioned Scribes and Pharisees made James stand on the turret of the Temple, and they cried out to him and said, "Oh, just one, to whom we all owe obedience, since the people go astray after Jesus who was crucified, tell what is the door of Jesus?"¹⁶ And he answered with a loud voice: "Why do you ask me about the son of man? He is sitting in heaven on the right hand of the great power, and he shall come upon the clouds of heaven."¹⁷ And when many were fully satisfied and glorified in the testimony of James and said: "Hosanna to the Son of David," then again the same Scribes and Pharisees said to one another: "We have done badly in furnishing Jesus with such testimony, but let us go up and cast him down that through fear they may not believe him." And they cried out, saying: "Oh, Oh, even the just one has erred," and they fulfilled the Scripture written in Isaiah: "Let us take away the just man, because he is troublesome to us."¹⁸ Yet they shall eat the fruit of their doings."¹⁹ So they went up and cast down the Just, and they said to one another: "Let us stone James the Just," and they began to stone him,

16 This entire problem of 'the way' or 'the door' is very difficult; the tradition seems quite confused. According to some, the Jews wished to learn James' opinion of Christ, whether he thought Him to be a true guide or an imposter, and so they asked: 'What, i.e., of what sort, is the door (or the way) of Christ? Is it a door which opens into life (or a way which leads to life); or is it a door which opens upon death (or a way which leads to death)?' The two ways and the two doors are compared in Matt. 7.13,14. The reference above to the Prophets, however, is still unexplained.

17 Cf. Matt. 26.64; Mark 14.62.

18 Cf. Wisd. 2.12.

19 Cf. Isa. 3.10. The first part of the quotation is from the Wisdom of Solomon.

since, though he had been cast down, he did not die, but he turned and with his knees on the ground said: "I beseech thee, Lord, God and Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."²⁰ And while they were stoning him thus, one of the priests of the sons of Rechab, the son of Rechabim,²¹ who are mentioned by Jeremias the Prophet, cried out saying: "Stop! What are you doing? The Just is praying for you." And someone among them, one of the laundrymen, took the club with which he beat out the clothes, and struck the Just upon the head, and thus he suffered martyrdom.²² And they buried him on the spot near the temple, and his gravestone still remains near the temple.²³ This man became a true witness to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ. And immediately Vespasian besieged them.²⁴

This account, quite in agreement with Clement,²⁴ is also given at length by Hegesippus. So wonderful a person, then, was James and so famous among all for righteousness that the wise even among the Jews believed that this was the

²⁰ Cf. Luke 23.34.

²¹ A confused and improbable story. The text of Hegesippus appears to be corrupt, for Rechabim is simply the reproduction in Greek letters of the Hebrew plural and is equivalent to 'the Rechabites'; yet the text omits the article as if it were the name of an individual and thus merely repeats the previous phrase. Furthermore, the Rechabites were a branch of Kenites who were adopted into Israel. Cf. 1 *Chron.* 2.55 and Jer. 35.19. It appears that a Rechabite could never be a Levite, and that the name was that of a sect to which a priest or Levite could not belong. In Epiphanius (*Haer.* 78.14), Simeon, the son of Clopas, replaces the Rechabite. This appears to be an effort on the part of a later tradition to clarify the vagueness of the earlier story. Cf. Jer. 35.19; also 42.

²² Clement, quoted above (5.4), follows Hegesippus, but omits the stoning which preceded. Josephus, however, mentions only the stoning. There is no reason to question either.

²³ This cannot be identified. A monument, now commonly known as the tomb of St. James, is shown at a long distance from the Temple, on the east side of the Valley of Jehosaphat.

²⁴ This agreement is not surprising, since Clement probably obtained his information from the account of Hegesippus.

cause of the siege of Jerusalem immediately after his martyrdom, which in their opinion happened to them for no other reason than the crime which had been committed against him.

Of course, Josephus did not hesitate to bear witness to this also in writing, using the following words: 'And these things happened to the Jews to avenge James the Just, who was a brother of Jesus the so-called Christ, since the Jews killed him who was most righteous.'²⁵

The same writer also describes his [James'] death in Book 20 of the *Antiquities* as follows:²⁶ 'Now Caesar, when he learned of the death of Festus, sent Albinus²⁷ as governor to Judaea. But the younger Ananus, ²⁸ whom we have mentioned as having received the high priesthood, was bold of character and exceedingly daring, and he followed the sect of the Sadducees, who in their judgments are cruel beyond all the Jews, as we have already shown.'²⁹ Now, Ananus, inasmuch as he was of such a character, thinking that he had a suitable opportunity because Festus had died and Albinus was still on his way, held a session of the council of judges, and bringing before it the brother of Jesus, the so-called Christ, whose name was James, and certain others, he handed them

25 This passage is not found in the existing manuscripts of Josephus. It is, however, given by Origen in *Contra Celsum* 1.47, which at least shows that Eusebius did not invent the words.

26 Josephus, *A.I.* 20.197,199-203; *B.I.* 2.166.

27 Albinus, a very corrupt governor, succeeded Festus in 61 or 62, and he in turn was succeeded by Gessius Florus in 61 or 62.

28 The fifth son of the high priest Annas mentioned in the New Testament. In this same passage, which Eusebius abridges, Josephus tells us that his father and four brothers had been high priests before him. He was appointed high priest by Agrippa II in 61 or 62, and was in office for only three months.

29 There is no previous mention in Josephus of the cruelty of the Sadducees. Perhaps a part of the account of the Sadducees and the Pharisees is lost.

over to be stoned,³⁰ making the charge that they had broken the Law. But all those in the city who seemed most reasonable and strict in matters of the Law were deeply disturbed about this and sent secretly to the emperor,³¹ urging him to order Ananus to cease doing such things, for he had not acted rightly from the very first. And some of them also went out to meet Albinus as he made his way from Alexandria, and informed him that Ananus could not hold a session of the council without his knowledge. And Albinus, being convinced by what was said, wrote angrily to Ananus, threatening to exact penalties of him, and for this reason the king, Agrippa, deprived him of the high priesthood,³² after he had held it for three months, and appointed Jesus,³³ the son of Dammaeus.'

Such were the actions against James, whose Epistle is said to be the first of the so-called Catholic epistles. But, we must realize that it is considered spurious; at least not many of the ancients quote it, as is true also of the so-called Epistle of Jude, which itself is one of the seven called Catholic; yet we know that these Epistles³⁴ have been used publicly together with the rest in most churches.

³⁰ The date of the martyrdom of James, as indicated here by Josephus, is 61 or 62, at the time of the Passover as Hegesippus says. This date is confirmed by Eusebius in his *Chron.*, when he puts the martyrdom in the seventh year of Nero's reign, i.e., 61. Jerome places it in the eighth year of Nero.

³¹ Or, possibly, to King Agrippa II.

³² Agrippa had power over the Temple, and could appoint and remove the high priests. Cf. above, 2.19.

³³ Nothing further is known of this Jesus. He was succeeded by Jesus, the son of Gamaliel. Cf. *Ant.* 20.9.4.

³⁴ On the Epistles of Peter, cf. below, 3.3; on the Epistles of John, cf. below, 3.44.

Chapter 24

While Nero was in the eighth year of his reign,¹ Annianus² was the first after Mark the Evangelist to succeed to the administration of the diocese³ of Alexandria.

Chapter 25

While the rule was now being strengthened by Nero, he directed his course into unholy pursuits and began to arm himself against the religion dedicated to the God of the universe. It would not be part of the present study to describe the depravity of such a man as this one became. Since many, to be sure, have handed down his story in most accurate descriptions,¹ it is possible for anyone at his pleasure to examine from them the crudeness of the man's degenerate madness. Under this influence he accomplished the death of so many thousands, quite without reason, and reached such a state of bloodguiltiness that he spared neither his nearest nor dearest and in various ways alike brought to death his mother, brothers, and wife,² as well as thousands of other

1 I.e., A.D. 62, with which Jerome in his *Chron.* agrees.

2 According to 3.14, below, Annianus held this office for twenty-two years. According to *Apost. Const.* 7.46, he ordained Mark as the first Bishop of Alexandria. He is commemorated in the Roman martyrology on April 25 together with St. Mark.

3 The Greek word (*paroikia*) is, literally: colony or province or parish.

1 Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 13-16; Suetonius, *Nero*, and Cassius Dio 61-63

2 According to 3.14, below, Annianus held this office for twenty-two years. Nero; his younger brother Britannicus was poisoned by his order at a banquet in 55; and his first wife, Octavia, who had been divorced that he might marry Poppaea, the wife of his friend, was afterward put to death. Poppaea herself died from the effects of a kick given her by Nero while she was pregnant.

family relatives, as if they were enemies and foes. Yet, with all these crimes, there still remained this to be written about him—that he should be the first of the emperors to be pointed out as a foe of divine religion. This, again, the Roman Tertullian³ mentions, speaking as follows: ‘Look at your records; there you will find that Nero was the first to persecute this teaching, when, after subduing the entire East, he was especially cruel to all in Rome.’⁴ We boast over such an author of our punishment. For he who knows that man can understand that, unless something were very good, it would not have been condemned by Nero.’

Thus, then, was this man heralded as above all the first fighter against God, and was raised up to slaughter the Apostles. It is recorded that Paul was beheaded in Rome itself⁵ and that Peter also was crucified in Nero’s time,⁶ and the title of ‘Peter and Paul’ over the cemeteries there, which has prevailed to the present day, confirms the story, and no less also does a man of the Church, named Caius,⁷ who lived

³ Cf. *Apol.* 5.

⁴ Eusebius’ Greek here appears to be a very poor translation of Tertullian’s Latin, which reads: ‘*Consulite commentarios vestros, illic reperietis primum Neronem in hanc sectam cum maxime Romae orientem Caesariano gladio ferocisse.*’ It may be translated thus: ‘Consult your records. There you will find that Nero was the first to rage with the imperial sword against this sect, just as it was arising in Rome.’

⁵ The tradition that Paul suffered martyrdom in Rome appears quite certain. There are no conflicting accounts in antiquity that contradict it. Clement (*Ad. Cor.* 5), Caius (quoted in Ch. 7), Dionysius of Corinth (quoted in Ch. 8), Origen (quoted in 3.1), and Tertullian in *De praescriptione haer.* 36, all bear witness to this report.

⁶ The tradition that Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome is as old and widespread as that pertaining to Paul. But the original tradition regarding Peter has been beclouded by some evident falsehood in details. In fact, some modern non-Catholic critics go so far as to reject it entirely. Modern archaeological discoveries, however, definitely back up the old tradition in its chief and important features.

⁷ A very learned ecclesiastical writer. At the beginning of the third century he held a disputation with Proclus in Rome. Cf. below, 6.20.

in the time of Zefyrinus,⁸ Bishop of Rome. This Caius, in a written disputation with Proclus,⁹ leader of the Phrygian heresy,¹⁰ has the following to say about the places where the sacred corpus of the afore-mentioned Apostles were deposited: 'But I can point out the trophies of the Apostles. For, if you are willing to go to the Vatican¹¹ or to the Ostian Way,¹² you will find the trophies of those who founded this Church.'¹³ And that they both suffered martyrdom at the same time, Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth,¹⁴ affirms as follows, when communicating with the Romans in writing:¹⁵ 'Thus, by so

All ancient evidence concerning this Caius stems from Eusebius. Photius (*Bibl.* 48), who lived 600 years after Caius, gives a detailed account of his life and activity, calling him a presbyter of the Roman Church and 'Bishop of the Gentiles.' The absence of any of this information in writers before Photius and other evidence cast serious doubt on this account of Caius by Photius.

8 Cf. Book 5, ch. 28, sect. 7.

9 Probably introduced the heresy of Montanism into Rome at the beginning of the third century.

10 I.e., the heresy of the Montanists, Montanism; called the 'Phrygian heresy' because of its origin in Phrygia. Regarding Montanism, cf. below, 4.27; 5.16ff.

11 According to the best evidence, and especially that of modern archaeology, Peter was crucified on Vatican Hill, where Nero's circus was, and where the persecution took place. His remains were said to have been buried in the Catacombs of San Sebastiano in 285, but to have been transferred in the fourth century to the Basilica of St. Peter, which stood on the site of the present basilica on the Vatican.

12 According to tradition, Paul was beheaded on the Ostian Way, near the present site of the Abbey of the Three Fountains. In the fourth century, when Peter's remains were transferred to the Vatican, Paul's body is said to have been buried in the Basilica of St. Paul, the site now occupied by the Church of San Paolo fuori le mura. The traditions as the spot where Peter and Paul met their death are in all probability true. They are as old as the second century, and the Church in Rome could hardly have forgotten these facts in a century and a half.

13 Of course, there were a few Christians in Rome when Paul and Peter got there. Moreover, Peter came to Rome some time after Paul. However, we see no difficulty in accepting the very old tradition that Paul and Peter founded the Church in Rome, in that they both contributed most in establishing the Church there on a firm footing.

14 On Dionysius of Corinth, cf. below, 4.23.

15 This Epistle to the Romans is quoted again in 4.23, below. It is extant only in these fragments.

great an admonition, you have brought together the planting that was made by Peter and Paul at Rome and at Corinth,¹⁶ for both of them alike planted in our Corinth and taught us, and both alike also taught in Italy in the same place and suffered martyrdom at the same time.¹⁷ I have quoted this, also, that the facts narrated may be confirmed still further.

Chapter 26

Josephus again,¹ who has told in detail most of the incidents pertaining to the disaster that took hold of the entire nation of the Jews, points out, in addition to a great many other things, how many thousands of those held in high honor by the Jews were tortured with whips in Jerusalem itself and were crucified by Florus;² and that he was Procurator of Judaea when it happened that the beginning of the war blazed up in the twelfth year of the reign of Nero.³ Then he also says that

16 It is very difficult to accept this tradition that both Paul and Peter established the Church in Corinth. Whatever the facts may be regarding their establishing the Church in Rome, all the evidence points to the work in Corinth as Paul's alone.

17 The Church celebrates the death of Peter on the 29th and that of Paul on the 30th of June, but has no definite year for the death of either. One tradition, that of Augustine and Prudentius, places their deaths on the same day, but one year apart. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 1) is the earliest writer to state that they both died on the same day. Eusebius places the martyrdom of both in 67; Jerome, in 68.

1 Cf. *B.I.* 2.306-308.

2 Cf. Josephus, *B.I.* 2.284; *A.I.* 20.257. He succeeded Albinus in 64, and earned for himself the reputation of being the most corrupt and unprincipled governor that Judaea ever had. He obtained his appointment through his wife, Cleopatra, and her friendship with the Empress Poppaea.

3 Cf. Josephus, *B.I.* 2.462,465. Josephus places the beginning of the war in the month of Artemision, which corresponds to the second month of the Jewish year, in 66, the second year of Gessius Florus. The Jews were driven to desperation by the wanton conduct of Florus. Vespasian began his operations in Galilee in the spring of 67. He had not appeared in Palestine before that.

throughout all Syria a terrible commotion arose because of the revolt of the Jews, for Gentiles everywhere were mercilessly attacked by the Jews dwelling in the cities as if they were foes, so that the cities could be seen full of unburied bodies, and old men together with children thrown out dead, and women lacking a covering even for their nakedness, and the whole province full of indescribable calamities, and the strain of what was threatened greater than what was actually being endured. This Josephus relates in detail, and the affairs of the Jews were in this state.

BOOK THREE

Chapter 1

IN SUCH A CONDITION were the affairs of the Jews, but of the holy Apostles and disciples of our Saviour who were scattered over the whole world,¹ Thomas, as tradition holds, received Parthia;² Andrew, Scythia;³ John,

¹ There are varying traditions concerning the labors of the Apostles in different countries after their separation at Jerusalem. The date of this separation itself varies from immediately after the Ascension to twenty-four years later. It is practically impossible to derive any trustworthy particulars regarding the Apostles themselves. According to the oldest tradition, there were three groups: (1) Peter and Andrew, Matthew and Bartholomew, who labored in the region of the Black Sea; (2) Thomas, Thaddeus, and Simeon the Canaanite, who preached in Parthia; (3) John and Philip, who journeyed into Asia Minor.

² At this time independent and extending from the Indus to the Tigris, and from the Caspian Sea to the Persian Gulf. Of the various traditions regarding Thomas, this is the oldest. A later tradition has him traveling as far east as India and suffering martyrdom there. His remains were exhibited there as late as the sixteenth century; the *Martyrium Romanum*, however, states that his remains were brought from India to Edessa, and from here to Ortona in Italy during the Crusades. Cf. the Clementine *Recognitiones* 9.29; Socrates *H.E.* 1.14 and 4.18; and Rufinus *H.E.* 2.5.

³ In a very general sense as used in antiquity, Scythia meant all the

Asia⁴ (and with the people there he lived and he died in Ephesus); but Peter⁵ seems to have preached in Pontus and Galatia and Bithynia and Cappadocia and Asia⁶ to the Jews of the Dispersion, and at last, having come to Rome, was crucified head-downwards,⁷ for he himself had asked to suffer so. What need we say about Paul,⁸ who fulfilled the gospel of Christ from Jerusalem to Illyricum and later suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero?⁹ These facts have been stated exactly by Origen in the third volume of his Commentary on Genesis.¹⁰

territory north of the Caspian and Black Seas. According to a more accurate use of the term, there were two Scythias: a European Scythia to the north of the Black Sea, between the Danube and the Tanais, as is meant here; and an Asiatic Scythia, extending toward the east from the Ural. The oldest tradition regarding Andrew gave him the region around the Black Sea, as indicated here. Because of this he has been made the patron saint of Russia. He also is a patron saint of Greece, and according to an ancient tradition was crucified there. According to Philostorgius, *H.E.* 3.2, his body was brought to Constantinople in 357 and was transferred to Amalpae in Italy during the Crusades. His remains are exhibited in the cathedral there today. There are many other traditions about St. Andrew, including one of the eighth century that took him to Scotland.

- 4 Proconsular Asia, including Mysia, Lydia, and Caria, a narrow strip along the coast of the Mediterranean. Ancient testimony agrees in assigning John's later life to Ephesus. Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3.1.1 and 3.4., and quotations of ancient testimony by Eusebius. He lived until the reign of Trajan (98-117). Cf. Irenaeus, 2.22.5 and 3.3.4.

5 1 Peter 1.1; also, below, 5.25.

6 The five provinces mentioned in 1 Peter 1.1.

7 This tradition is very doubtful. It first appears in Origen and becomes very common thereafter. The earlier Fathers, including Tertullian who speaks of the crucifixion of Peter, do not mention his having been crucified head-downwards. Of course, it is not impossible.

8 Cf. Rom. 15.19.

9 Cf. above, 2.25.

- 10 The greater part of this chapter seems to represent a fragment of Origen as indicated. It has not been preserved elsewhere.

Chapter 2

After the martyrdom of Paul and of Peter, Linus¹ was the first to succeed to the episcopacy of the Church at Rome. Paul, when writing from Rome to Timothy, makes mention of him in the salutation at the end of the Epistle.²

Chapter 3

Now, one letter of Peter, his so-called first Epistle, is admitted to be genuine,¹ and the ancient presbyters made use of this Epistle as undisputed in their own writings. The reputed second Epistle we have ascertained to be not canonical;² nevertheless, since it appeared useful to many, it has been studied together with the other Scriptures. However, the writing of the Acts³ imputed to him, and the Gospel⁴ that bears his name, and the Preaching⁵ spoken of as his, and the so-called Revelation⁶ we know have not been handed down

1 The order of the first three Bishops of Rome is greatly disputed. The order given here by Eusebius, namely, Linus, Anencletus, and Clement, is that given by Irenaeus in *Adv. Haer.* 3.3.3, and is the oldest. Hippolytus gives four names in this order—Linus, Clement, Cletus, and Anacletus—which is followed by the Church.

2 Tim. 4.21.

1 Eusebius seems certainly to be correct in acknowledging the authenticity of the first Epistle of Peter. He has the unanimous backing of patristic tradition. Certain critics, however, have attempted to deny this.

2 This Epistle was admitted into the canon at the Council of Hippo in 393. All questions and discussions as to its authorship then ceased until the Protestant Revolt, when doubt was raised again by some and has continued ever since.

3 For an English translation of these Acts, cf. *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (American ed.) VIII 477.

4 No longer extant, and in any case apparently heretical.

5 No longer extant, although mentioned frequently by the early Fathers. Origen (*De princ. Praef.* 8) definitely classifies it as spurious.

6 Only a few fragments are extant. After the time of Eusebius the work appears to have been regarded everywhere as spurious. In the

at all among Catholics, because no orthodox writer among the ancients or in our own time has made use of their testimonies.⁷ As my history proceeds, I shall make it a point to indicate in succession which of the orthodox writers in each period made use of any of the disputed works and what they said about the canonical and accepted writings and what about those which are not so. But, such are the works which are called Peter's, among which I recognize only one Epistle as genuine and so acknowledged by the presbyters of old. And the fourteen⁸ Epistles of Paul are manifest and clear, yet it is not right to ignore that some have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews⁹ as spurious, saying that it was disputed by the Church of Rome, on the ground that it was not by Paul. I shall set forth at the proper time¹⁰ what was said about this Epistle by our predecessors. Indeed, not even have I received his so-called Acts¹¹ among the undisputed writings. But since the same Apostle in the salutations at the end of the Epistle to the Romans¹² has made mention among others of Hermas,

early Church it enjoyed some favor and was accepted as genuine by some of the Fathers. Because of this recognition in orthodox circles it in all probability contained nothing offensive to the Church. Cf. below, 4.14.

- 7 This statement is entirely too sweeping. The work was in general use in the second century, and Clement, as we learn from Eusebius himself (6.14), wrote a commentary on it.
- 8 The thirteen Epistles of St. Paul as they appear in our present canon, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. These were for Eusebius of undisputed authorship, and were so accepted until the nineteenth century. The Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians have never been seriously disputed as to canonicity or authorship. The others have been more or less questioned since 1824, when Testeri questioned the genuineness of Ephesians.
- 9 The canonicity of this Epistle has never been questioned, but its authorship has been disputed from the early Fathers to our own day.
- 10 Cf. below, 6.14, 20, 25.
- 11 These Acts are also mentioned in Ch. 25. Eusebius seems to imply that they were originally regarded as canonical, but were not generally regarded as such in his own time. These Acts of Paul are not to be confused with the Gnostic version which from the end of the fourth century made up a part of the Manichaean canon of the New Testament.
- 12 Cf. Rom. 16.14.

whose, they say, is the Book of the Shepherd,¹³ we must realize that this also was rejected by some, and because of these it should not be placed among approved works, but by others it has been judged as most indispensable for those especially who need elementary instruction. We know that for this purpose it has been used publicly in the churches in recent times, and I have found that some of the most ancient authors have drawn on it. Let these words suffice to establish the divine writings that are undisputed and those which are not acknowledged by all.

Chapter 4

It should be clear from Paul's own words,¹ and from what Luke has related in the Acts,² that Paul, when preaching to the Gentiles, laid the foundation of the churches 'from Jerusalem round about as far as unto Illyricum.' And from the very words of Peter,³ from the Epistle which we have mentioned as indisputably his, in which he writes to the Hebrews who were in the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, it should be clear in how many provinces he, too, handed down the word of the New Testament by preaching the Gospel of Christ to those of the circumcision. But it is not easy to say how many and who of these became genuinely zealous and were judged able to be pastors of the churches founded by them, except such as one

¹³ The Book of the Shepherd by Hermas was in circulation as early as the latter half of the second century. It was regularly quoted as an inspired work but was not placed in the canon. It seems to have passed out of use in the fourth century. St. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 10) says that it was practically unknown in his time. Cf. notes to translation in *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. 1 of the present series.

¹ Cf. Rom. 15.19.

² Cf. Acts 9ff.

³ Cf. Peter 1.1.

might list from the words of Paul. His fellow workers and fellow soldiers, as he himself called them, numbered many thousands, the majority of whom he considered worthy of an everlasting memorial, for he has made his testimony to them unceasing in his own letters.⁴ Moreover, Luke also, as he lists those known to him, makes mention of them by name.⁵ So Timothy⁶ is recorded as the first to receive the bishopric of the diocese of Ephesus, as also was Titus⁷ of the churches in Crete. Luke,⁸ who was by race an Antiochian and by profession a physician, had long been a companion of Paul, and had more than a casual acquaintance with the rest of the Apostles. He has left us in two inspired books examples of the art of healing for souls which be obtained from them: namely,

4 Cf. Phil. 2.25; Philem. 2.

5 These are as follows, all mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles: Barnabas (9.27 and *passim*); John Mark (12.25; 13.13; 15.37,39); Silas (15.40); Timothy (16.1ff and *passim*); Aquila and Priscilla (18); Erastus (19.22); Gaius of Macedonia (19.29); Aristarchus (19.29; 20.4; 27.2); Sopater, Secundus, Gaius of Derbe (possibly to be identified with Gaius of Macedonia), and Tychichus (20.4); and Trophimus (20.4; 21.29).

6 Cf. 1 Tim. 1.3. St. Timothy is commemorated on January 21. The tradition that Timothy was the first Bishop of Ephesus, as given here by Eusebius, is repeated by the *Apost. Const.* (7.46), and by Nicephorus (*H.E.* 3.11). The latter also states that he suffered martyrdom under Domitian. There appears to be no good reason to doubt this tradition.

7 Titus 1.5. St. Titus is commemorated on January 4. He is said to have been of royal Cretan birth and to have been Bishop of Gortyna, where the ruins of the church which bears his name still stand. According to 2 Tim. 4.10, he traveled to Dalmatia, but Candia, the modern capital of Crete, claims his final resting place.

8 St. Luke is commemorated on October 18. All that we know about him comes from St. Paul (Col. 4.14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. 4.11): namely, he was a physician, was a very dear fellow worker of St. Paul, and was with St. Paul during his last imprisonment. Although Irenaeus is the first to ascribe the third Gospel and the Acts to St. Luke, he gives us no additional personal information. Eusebius gives us what appears to be the universally accepted tradition of his day, that he was born at Antioch. According to Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* 25), he labored in Achaia, and was a martyr (*Orat.* 4). St. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 7) states that he was buried at Constantinople.

the Gospel, which he testifies that he planned according to what those who were eye-witnesses from the beginning and ministers of the word had handed down to him, all of whom he says he had followed from the first,⁹ and the Acts of the Apostles,¹⁰ which he composed on the evidence not of hearsay but of his own eyes. And they say that Paul was actually accustomed to quote the Gospel according to St. Luke, since when writing about some Gospel as his own he used to say, 'According to my Gospel.'¹¹ Of the rest of Paul's followers, there is evidence from Paul himself that Crescens was sent to Gaul,¹² and Linus, whom he mentioned in the second Epistle to Timothy¹³ as being with him in Rome, has already been shown to have been the first after Peter to have been appointed to the episcopacy of the Church in Rome. And of Clement, also, who was himself appointed the third Bishop of the Church at Rome, there is evidence from Paul that he was his co-worker and fellow soldier.¹⁴ Besides these, that member of the Areopagus, Dionysius by name, whom Luke records in the Acts¹⁵ as having received the faith for the

9 Cf. Luke 1.2.3.

10 The Apostolic Fathers, Justin, and Tatian exhibit some knowledge of the Acts. Except for heretics, this work held an undisputed place in the canon from the beginning. Tradition, beginning with the Muratorian fragment and Irenaeus, has been essentially unanimous in ascribing it to Luke. Irenaeus (3.1.1) seems to state that it was written after the deaths of Peter and Paul. A tradition arose later, followed by St. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 7), that it was composed during the lifetime of Paul, and this has been accepted by conservative scholars.

11 Cf. Rom. 2.16; 16.25; 2 Tim. 2.8.

12 Cf. 2 Tim. 4.10.

13 Cf. 2 Tim. 4.21.

14 Cf. Phil. 4.3.

15 Cf. Acts 17.34. The works of Dionysius the Areopagite or, better, Pseudo-Areopagite, have had a tremendous influence on the theology of the Middle Ages. The evidence of his own writings indicates that, although he pretends to be a contemporary of the Apostles, he belongs, at the very earliest, to the latter half of the fifth century, and is not to be identified with the real Areopagite mentioned here, and whose name he assumes.

first time after Paul's public address to the Athenians in the Areopagus, is described by one of the ancients, another Dionysius, shepherd of the diocese of Corinth,¹⁶ as having been the first Bishop of the Church at Athens. As we proceed on our way, we will relate at the proper time the chronological details of the succession of the Apostles; meanwhile, let us go on with the succeeding events of our history.

Chapter 5

After Nero was master of the sovereignty for thirteen years,¹ and the affairs of Galba and Otho had occupied a year and six months,² Vespasian, who was famous for his campaigns against the Jews, was declared ruler over Judaea itself, having been proclaimed emperor by the armies there.³ So he set out at once on the road to Rome, and entrusted the war against the Jews to his son Titus.⁴ The Jews, after the ascension of our Saviour, in addition to their crime against Him, now devised innumerable plots against His Apostles, also. First,

16 On Dionysius of Corinth, cf. below, 4.23.

1 Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 4.491. Nero's reign extended from October 16, 54, to June 9, 68.

2 Eusebius is careless here. He omits Vitellius. The combined reigns of Galba (June 9, 68, to January 15, 69), Otho (January 15 to April 20, 69), and Vitellius (January 2 to December 22, 69) amounted to about eighteen months.

3 Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 4.658. Eusebius is essentially correct, although not exact in details. While Vitellius was the recognized emperor in Italy, Vespasian was proclaimed emperor at Alexandria, July 1, 69, by the prefect of Egypt. Vespasian's armies in Judaea and, a little later, all the legions in the East confirmed this. His generals conquered Vitellius and slew him in Italy on December 20, 69. Vespasian was then recognized by the Roman Senate, and he himself arrived in Italy in the summer of 70.

4 Titus carried on the siege of Jerusalem after his father's departure, and brought it to a close on September 8, 70.

Stephen was stoned to death by them; then, after him, James, who was the son of Zebedee and the brother of John, was beheaded;⁵ and above all, James, who was the first to obtain the episcopal seat in Jerusalem after the ascension of our Saviour, met death in the manner described above.⁶ The death of the rest of the Apostles was plotted in numerous ways and they were driven from the land of Judaea, and they went their way to teach the Gospel among all the nations, supported by the power of Christ, who said to them: 'Going teach ye all nations in my name.'⁷ But the people of the Church at Jerusalem were commanded by an oracle given out by revelation before the war to esteemed men there to depart from the city and to inhabit a city of Peraea which they called Pella.⁸ Those who believed in Christ migrated to this city from Jerusalem, that, when holy men had entirely abandoned the royal capital of the Jews and the entire land of Judaea, the judgment of God might soon overtake them for their many crimes against Christ and His Apostles and utterly destroy that generation of the wicked from among men. Whoever wishes can gather accurately from the history written by Josephus⁹ how many evils everywhere overwhelmed the entire nation at that time; and how especially the inhabitants of Judaea were driven to an extremity of misfortunes; and how many thousands of youths, together with women and children, perished by the sword and by hunger

5 Cf. Acts 6.8ff. and 12.2.

6 Cf. above, 2.23.

7 Cf. Matt. 28.19. Eusebius usually omits the reference to baptism when quoting this passage. Some think that he is following a text in an earlier form; others, that he wished to keep the formula of baptism secret.

8 In northern Perea, beyond the Jordan, within the territory of Herod Agrippa II. Epiphanius (*De Pond. et Mens.* 15) also mentions this flight of the Christians to Pella. The people in the vicinity of Pella were for the greater part Gentiles.

9 Josephus, *B.J.* Bks. 5 and 6.

and countless other forms of death; and how many and what famous cities of the Jews were besieged; and also what terrors and worse than terrors those saw who fled to Jerusalem itself as to a most mighty capital; the nature of the whole war and every detail of what happened in it; and how, finally, the abomination of desolation proclaimed by the Prophets¹⁰ was established in the very Temple of God, celebrated of old, which suffered complete destruction and total disappearance in flames. But it must be pointed out that this same writer relates that the multitude of those assembled from all Judaea in the days of the Feast of the Passover to the number of three million¹¹ were shut off in Jerusalem, to use his very words, 'as in a prison.' Now, it was right that in those very days in which they had arranged for the Passion of the Saviour and Benefactor of all men they, shut off 'as in a prison,' should receive the destruction which pursued them at the hands of divine justice.

Passing over, then, the details of the calamities that befell them through attempts on their lives by the sword and other means, I think that I must present those misfortunes only that were the result of hunger, in order that those who read this work may be able to know in part how the vengeance of God followed after them not long afterwards for their lawlessness against the Christ of God.

Chapter 6

Come, then, take in hand Book 5 of the *History* of Josephus, and go over the tragedy of what was done at that

10 Cf. Dan. 9.27; 12.13; Matt. 24.15; Mark 13.14.

11 Josephus *B.J.* 6.425-428. Eusebius is giving round numbers. Evidence from other authors indicates that this figure is grossly exaggerated.

time. 'Surely,' he says, 'for the rich to remain was tantamount to destruction; under pretext of intended desertion they were murdered for their wealth. The madness of the rebels grew with the famine, and both terrors blazed forth the more day by day. Food was nowhere visible, but rushing into houses they searched them. Then, if they found any, they tortured the owners for having denied that they had it, and if they did not find any they tormented them on the ground that they had concealed it too carefully. The proof of their having or not having food was the bodies of the poor wretches. Those of them who were still in good condition they judged to be well provided with nourishment; those who were already wasting away were passed by, and it appeared foolish to kill them, since they would soon die because of want. Many secretly exchanged their possessions for one measure of wheat, if they were really richer; barley, if they were really poorer. Then, shutting themselves off in the intermost recesses of their homes, some because of extreme want ate the grain uncooked; others baked it as necessity and fear dictated. Nowhere was a table set, but, snatching the food still uncooked from the fire, they tore it to pieces. Pitable was their fare, and worthy of tears was the sight, as the stronger plundered and the weak wailed. Famine indeed surpasses all suffering, but it destroys nothing so much as a sense of decency; for what is under other circumstances worthy of respect is despised in the midst of famine. Thus, wives snatched food from the very mouths of husbands, children from fathers, and, most pitiable of all, mothers from children, and while their dearest were wasting away in their arms, there was no reluctance about snatching away the last drops that sustained life. Yet they did not escape notice as they ate in this way, but everywhere robbers came upon them and deprived them even of this. For, wherever they saw a house shut up, this was a sign that those within

were bringing in food; at once they shattered the doors, rushed in, and carried off the morsels, all but forcing them out of their throats. Old men were beaten because they clung to their food, and women were pulled by the hair for concealing it in their hands; nor was there any pity for grey old age or for little children, but picking up the babes that clung to their morsels they dashed them upon the ground. To those who anticipated their entrance and gulped down what was to be seized, they were more cruel, as if they had been wronged by them, and they devised terrible ways of torture for the discovery of food, blocking up the passageways of the privy parts of the poor wretches with bitter herbs and piercing their seats with sharp rods. One suffered things horrible even to hear, to force the confession of a single loaf, and to disclose a single pint of hidden barley. The torturers did not suffer hunger (indeed, they would have been less cruel if they had so acted of necessity), but they were performing their tortures to practice their madness and to provide sustenance for days to come. And when some crawled forth in the night to the outposts of the Roman lines to gather wild herbs and grass, they went to meet them, just as they thought that they had at last eluded the enemy, and they plundered what they were carrying, and although they repeatedly begged them and called upon the most awful name of God to share with them a part of what they were carrying at great risk, they shared nothing at all, and it was fortunate that he who was robbed was not also slain.¹

Josephus, after other details, continues with the following words:² 'All hope of escape for the Jews was cut off with the closing of the exits,³ and, when the famine deepened, house

¹ Josephus, *B.I.* 5.424-438.

² *Ibid.* 5.512-519.

³ In the paragraph immediately preceding the present quotation, Josephus describes how Titus had built a wall around Jerusalem, thus cutting off every possible means of escape.

by house and family by family it kept feeding upon the people, and the rooms were filled with dead women and children, and the alley-ways with corpses of old men, and children and youths swollen from famine wandered through the market places like ghosts and fell down wherever the last agony seized one. Those who were sick did not have the strength to bury their relatives and those who retained their strength hesitated to do so because of the great number of the dead and the uncertainty of their own fate. Thus, many fell dead over those they were burying, and many went to their graves before the necessity arose. There was neither lamentation nor wailing in the midst of the misfortunes, but famine conquered emotions, and those who were dying a lingering death looked with dry eyes upon those who had gone to their rest before them. A deep silence and night teeming with death encircled the city. Worse even than these were the robbers. Breaking into houses as if they were tombs, they plundered the dead, and stripping the coverings from around the bodies they departed with laughter. They tried the tips of their swords in the corpses, and to prove the steel ran through some of the fallen who were still alive, and those who begged that a right hand and a sword be used upon them they disdainfully left behind to famine. Each one of those who expired looked steadfastly upon the Temple, having left the rebellious above. There were those who urged that the bodies be buried at the public expense, since the stench was unbearable. Then, when they were unequal to this, they threw them from the walls into the trenches. And when Titus was walking about the trenches and saw them filled with corpses and thick gore oozing out of the rotting bodies, he groaned, and raising his hands he called God to witness that this was no deed of his.'

A little later he adds something to this in the following words:⁴ 'I could not refrain from expressing what my feelings

⁴ Josephus, *B.I.* 5.566.

bade me. I think that, if the Romans had delayed their attack against these sinners, the city would either have been swallowed up by a chasm or overwhelmed with a flood or have shared the thunderbolts of Sodom, for it had borne a race much more godless than those who had suffered thus. In any case, the entire people were destroyed by the madness of these.'

In Book 6 he writes thus:⁵ 'Of those who perished from hunger through the city, countless was the number that fell, and indescribable were the sufferings that befell them. For, if in each house there appeared a shadow of sustenance anywhere, fighting took place, and the dearest friends engaged in hand-to-hand conflict with one another, snatching away the wretched sustenance of life. And there was no trusting the deprivation of the dying, but robbers searched them while they were still breathing, lest some one, while concealing food in his bosom, feign death. Others, with mouths gaping from lack of food, stumbled and darted here and there like mad dogs, and beating upon doors in the manner of drunken men they rushed into the same houses twice and three times within a single hour from utter helplessness. Necessity brought all things to men's teeth, and they collected and brought themselves to eat things unfit even for the filthiest of irrational beasts. Finally, they did not refrain even from girdles and shoes, and they stripped the hides from their shields and chewed them. Wisps of old hay were sustenance for some, since they gathered stubble and sold small portions for four Attic drachmae.'⁶

'And why should I speak of the shamelessness of the famine toward inanimate things? I shall proceed to describe a result of it such as is recorded neither among Greeks nor barbarians,

⁵ *Ibid.* 6.193-213.

⁶ About sixty cents.

frightful to tell, incredible to hear. Indeed, lest I should appear to future generations to be indulging in fantasy, I gladly would have omitted the calamity did I not have countless witnesses from those of my own generation. Especially would I render my country cold comfort, did I compromise the story of the sufferings which she endured. A woman among those who live beyond the Jordan, Mary by name, whose father was Eliezer of the village of Bathezor (which means "House of Hyssop") and who was famous for her family and wealth, fled to Jerusalem with the rest of the multitude and was caught in the siege with them. The tyrants had plundered the rest of her property, such as she had gathered together and brought into the city from Peraea, and the guards rushed in daily and seized the remnants of her property and whatever food they laid their eyes on. A terrible vexation came upon the woman, and by continually insulting and cursing the robbers she tried to provoke them against herself. But, when no one killed her either through anger or through pity and she grew weary of finding food for others (it was now quite impossible to find any anywhere), famine penetrated her vitals and marrow, and rage began to burn more fiercely than famine. She took anger and necessity as her councilors, and turned against nature. She seized her child (she had a boy at the breast) and said: "Wretched child, for what⁷ do I protect you in war, famine, and rebellion? Even if we live among them as slaves to the Romans, famine anticipates slavery, and the rioters are worse than both. Come, be my nourishment, an avenging fury⁸ to the rioters and a byword to the world, the only account still lacking to the calamities of the Jews." As she said this, she

⁷ This may be translated 'for whom.'

⁸ According to the popular belief that the souls of the murdered, like furies, tormented those chiefly responsible for their death.

killed her son, then roasted him and ate half; the remainder she covered up and kept. Immediately the rioters were at hand and, smelling the nefarious savor, they threatened to slay her at once if she did not show them what she had prepared. She said that she had kept a good helping for them and uncovered the remains of the child. Horror and amazement at once seized them, and they stood transfixed at the sight. But she said: "This is my own child, and the deed is mine. Eat, for I, too, have eaten. Do not be more gentle than a woman or more compassionate than a mother. But, if you are pious and turn aside my sacrifice, I have already eaten for you; let the rest remain for me." Thereupon, they went out trembling, cowardly before this alone, and with difficulty did they yield the food to the mother. But the whole city was immediately filled with horror, and each one as he held the tragedy before his eyes trembled as if he himself had committed the crime. There was an eagerness for death on the part of those suffering from hunger, and blessed were those who met death before they heard or saw evils such as these.'

Chapter 7

Such were the rewards of the lawlessness and the impiety of the Jews against the Christ of God, but it is worth while to append to these the infallible prediction of our Saviour in which He pointed out these very things as He spoke thus in prophecy: 'And woe to them that are with child, and that give suck in those days. But pray that your flight be not in the winter or on the sabbath. For there shall be then great tribulation such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now, neither shall be.'¹ And the historian,

¹ Matt. 24.19-21.

reckoning the entire number of those who had been destroyed, says² that 1,100,000 perished by famine and the sword, and that the other rioters and robbers after the capture of the city were pointed out by one another and slain. But the tallest of the youths and those distinguished for beauty of body were kept for a triumph, and of the rest of the multitude those over seventeen years of age were sent as prisoners to labor in Egypt,³ but more were scattered throughout the provinces to perish in the theatres by the sword and by wild beasts. Those under seventeen years were lead away to be sold into slavery, and of these alone the number was reckoned to be about 90,000 men.⁴

These things took place in this manner in the second year of the reign of Vespasian⁵ in accordance with the prophetic pronouncements of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who by divine power foresaw these events as if already present and wept over them and mourned according to the writings of the holy Evangelists, who append His very words, when on one occasion He spoke as if to Jerusalem herself: 'If thou also hadst known, and that in this thy day, the things that are to thy peace; but now they are hidden from thy eyes. For the days shall come upon thee: and thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and straiten thee on every side. And beat thee flat to the ground, and thy

2 Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 6.420, 417, 418, 420, 435. Josephus gives only the number, but says nothing of the manner in which they were slain.

3 In the great stone quarries (commonly called the mines) of Egypt. These quarries were for the most part conducted by the Roman government, which used captives of war for labor. They furnished much of the fine marble for building purposes in Rome and elsewhere.

4 Josephus says simply that the total number of prisoners taken in the entire war was 97,000. Eusebius apparently misread the number, and applied it to only one class of prisoners.

5 Josephus dates the completion of the siege on September 8, 70.

children who are in thee.⁶ And then on another occasion, as if with regard to the people, He said: 'For there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword; and shall be led away captives into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles; till the times of the nations be fulfilled.'⁷ And again: 'And when you shall see Jerusalem compassed about with an army; then know that the desolation thereof is at hand.'⁸ If one should compare the words of our Saviour with the other narratives of the historian, how could he help but marvel and confess the truly divine and supernaturally wonderful foreknowledge and prophecy of our Saviour? Now, it should not be necessary to add to the histories from what happened to the whole nation after the Passion of the Saviour and those words in which the multitude of the Jews begged off from death the robber and the murderer, yet begged that the Prince of Life be taken from them.⁹ But it would be just to add those events which might be confirmations of the kindness of the all-good Providence, which for forty full years after their crime against Christ held off their destruction, during which many of the Apostles and disciples and James himself, called the brother of the Lord,¹⁰ the first bishop of this city, were still in this life and made sojourns in the city of Jerusalem itself, offering, as it were, a very strong protection to the place. Divine Providence continued to be long-suffering, if indeed they might at last repent of their deeds and obtain forgiveness and salvation; in addition to such long-suffering, Providence furnished wonderful signs from God of what would happen to them if they did not repent. Since those

6 Luke 19.42-44.

7 Luke 21.23-24.

8 Luke 21.20.

9 Cf. Luke 23.18, 19; John 18.40; Acts 3.14.

10 Cf. above, 1.12.

things have been thought worthy of mention by the historian quoted above, we can do nothing better than append them for the reader of this work.

Chapter 8

Take, then, and read what has been recorded by the author in Book 6 of his *History* regarding these matters:¹ 'At that time, deceivers and liars against God won over the wretched people, and to the clear marvels which foretold the future desolation they gave neither heed nor credence, but as if thunder-struck and without eyes or soul they failed to hear the proclamations of God. At one time a star stood over the city like a sword, and a comet which lasted for a year. At another time, before the revolt and the disturbance that led to war, when the people were being assembled for the Feast of Unleavened Bread, on the eighth of the month of April,² at the ninth hour of the night, so strong a light shone on the altar and on the Temple that it seemed to be bright day, and this continued for half an hour. This seemed to the inexperienced to be a good sign, but it was immediately interpreted by the sacred scribes before the actual events that followed. And at the same feast a cow led by the high priest to the sacrifice gave birth to a lamb in the middle of the temple. And the eastern gate of the inner temple, which was of bronze and very massive and which twenty men had difficulty in closing at night, for it rested upon iron-bound beams and had bars sunk deep, was seen at night at the sixth hour to have opened by itself. And after the feast, not many days later, on

1 Cf. Josephus, *B.I.* 6.288-304.

2 The Feast of the Passover; Josephus uses the Greek name of the month, Xanthikus.

the twenty-first day of the month of May,³ a kind of demoniac vision beyond belief was seen, and what will be related would have seemed to be a fable had it not been told by those who saw it and were the sufferings that followed not worthy of the portents. For, before the setting of the sun there was seen over the whole country in mid air chariots and armed troops darting through the clouds and encircling the cities. And at the Feast called Pentecost the priests came to the Temple for the services, as was their custom, and said that they first perceived movement and noise, and after this a cry as from a multitude: "We go hence."⁴ But the following is more terrible than this, for a man of the common people, Jesus by name, son of Ananias, a rustic, four years before the war,⁵ when the city was especially peaceful and prosperous, came to the feast when it was the custom for all to make booths for God,⁶ and suddenly at the Temple he began to cry out: "A voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the temple, a voice against bridegrooms and brides, a voice against all the people." Shouting this by day and by night, he went about through all the narrow streets. But some of the distinguished members of the citizenry, becoming irritated at the bad omen, seized the man and crushed him with many blows. He, however, said nothing in his own behalf, nor did he privately to those present, but continued shouting the words that he had before. And the rulers thought, as was the case, that the man's excitement was rather inspired and they brought him to the Roman governor.⁷ There, on being flayed

³ Josephus uses the Greek name Artemisium.

⁴ Cf. Eusebius, *Dom. Evangel.* 8.2.121, and *Eccl. Prophet.* 164.2-6.

⁵ In 62, since, according to Josephus, the war began in 66.

⁶ The Feast of the Tabernacles, beginning on the 15th day of the seventh month of the Jewish year, and continuing for seven days.

⁷ Albinus, procurator from 61 to 64; cf. above, 2.22.23.

to the bone with scourges, he uttered no plea nor shed a tear, but with all his power raising his voice pitifully, he answered to every stroke: "Woe, woe to Jerusalem."

The same writer gives a still more remarkable account than this, when he says⁸ that an oracle was found in 'sacred script' to the effect that, at this time, some one from their country would rule the world and he himself understood that this had been fulfilled by Vespasian. However, he did not rule over the whole world, but only that part subject to the Romans; more justly would this be a reference to Christ, to whom it was said by the Father: 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession,'⁹ and it was at that very time that 'the sound' of His holy Apostles 'hath gone forth into all the earth: and their words unto the ends of the world.'¹⁰

Chapter 9

Besides all this, it is right not to ignore Josephus himself, whence and from what family he came, who has contributed so much to the history at hand. He himself also makes this clear, when he speaks thus: 'Josephus, the son of Matthias, a priest of Jerusalem, who himself at first fought against the Romans and of necessity took part in later events.'¹ He was

⁸ Cf. Josephus, *B.I.* 6.312,313.

⁹ Ps. 2.8.

¹⁰ Cf. Ps. 18.5.

¹ Cf. *B.I.* 1.3. Flavius Josephus was born in Jerusalem in 37. He was descended from the Asmonaeon princes on his mother's side, and inherited the priestly office from his father, Matthias. When 26 years of age, he went to Rome to defend some Jewish priests whom Felix, Procurator of Judaea, had sent there as prisoners. He was successful in obtaining their release and also won great favor with the Empress Poppaea. When he returned to Jerusalem he found his fellow country-

by far the most celebrated Jew of that time, not only among those of his own race but also among the Romans, so that he was honored by the erection of a statue² in the city of Rome and by the inclusion in its library³ of the works he composed. He compiled the entire ancient history of the Jews in twenty volumes, and the history of the war with Romans is his own witness to having committed these not only to the Greek tongue⁴ but also to that of his fatherland. Since he is worthy of trust in other matters, he is so here. Two other works of his which are worthy of notice are extant: that entitled *On the Antiquity of the Jews*, and that in which he made reply to Apion the Scribe, who had at that time

men determined to revolt against Rome, and he attempted in vain to dissuade them from this foolhardy purpose. He finally gave way to popular feeling and permitted himself to be chosen one of the generals of the Jews. He defended Jotapata against Vespasian, and on the fall of the city was captured. Vespasian spared his life because he had prophesied that Vespasian would become emperor and would be succeeded by his son Titus. When Vespasian became emperor three years later, in 70, he released Josephus from prison. Josephus accompanied Titus at the siege of Jerusalem, and later returned to Rome with him. There he dwelt in a house given him by Vespasian, from whom he took the name Flavius, and died there about 98. He seems to have spent most of his time at Rome to the writing, in Greek, of: (1) the *History of the Jewish War*, in seven books, beginning with the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes in 170 B.C. and continuing to Josephus' own time and the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans (it is quoted as *B.I.* from its Latin title, *Bellum Iudaicum*); (2) the *Antiquities*, completed in twenty books about 93, and addressed to Epaphroditus, which presents Jewish history from the creation of the world to A.D. 66; (3) his *Autobiography*, in one book, really an appendage to the *Antiquities*, and addressed to the same Epaphroditus, probably written no earlier than 97, since Agrippa II is mentioned as no longer among the living; (4) *Against Apion* (from the Latin title, *Contra Apionem*), in two books and also addressed to Epaphroditus.

- 2 Eusebius is the only source who mentions this statue in Rome; the reliability of the statement is doubtful.
- 3 Undoubtedly the imperial library, originally established by Augustus, according to Suetonius, in the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine Hill. It contained two sections, one for Greek and the other for Latin works, and was greatly enlarged by Tiberius and Domitian.
- 4 Cf. Josephus, *B.I.* 1.3.

composed a treatise against the Jews, and to others who had themselves tried to vilify the ancestral institutions of the Jewish people. In the first of these he gives the number of the canonical scriptures of the so-called Old Testament, showing in the following words which are the undisputed among the Hebrews, as probably according to ancient tradition.⁵

Chapter 10

'Now there are no myriads of books among us which are discordant and conflicting, but only two and twenty, containing the record of all time and justly believed to be divine. And of these, five belong to Moses, and contain the Law and the tradition of human history down to the time of his death. This period falls a little short of 3,000 years. From the death of Moses to that of Artaxerxes who came after Xerxes, King of the Persians, the prophets after Moses described what took place in their own times in thirteen books.¹ The remaining four books² contain hymns to God and precepts of life for men. From the time of Artaxerxes³ to our own the details have been written,⁴ but they are not considered worthy of the same credence as those before them, because there has not been an accurate succession of prophets. It is clear, in fact, how we

5 Josephus, *C. Apion.* 1.38-42.

1 Josephus does not name these, but they probably are: Josue, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Kings (otherwise called the first and second Books of Samuel), 3 and 4 Kings, 1 and 2 Paralipomenon (otherwise called the first and second Books of Chronicles), 1 Esdras (or Ezra), 2 Esdras (also called the book of Nehemias), Esther, Isaias, Jeremias and Lamentations, Ezechiel, Daniel, the lesser Prophets, Job.

2 Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle of Canticles.

3 Artaxerxes Longimanus, who reigned from 464 to 425 B.C., and under whom Esdras and Nehemias labored and the later Prophets flourished.

4 He refers to 1 Machabees and probably 2 Machabees.

approach our own works of literature, for, although so much time has already passed, no one has had the temerity to make additions, omissions, or changes in them, but it is innate in all of us from our very birth to regard them as the decrees of God, and to abide by them, and to die for them gladly, if there be need.' Let these words of the author be so added for a useful purpose.

Another work not without merit was produced by the man on *The Supremacy of Reason*, which some have entitled *Machabees*,⁵ because it includes the struggles of those Hebrews mentioned in the so-called Book of the Machabees who contended valiantly for the worship of God. And at the end of Book 20 of the *Antiquities*,⁶ the same writer indicates that he had intended to write in four books on the ancestral opinions of the Jews regarding God and His nature, and concerning the laws—why they permit some things but forbid others. The same author also mentions in his own treatises that he had produced other works.⁷ Furthermore, it is right to quote also the words which he appended at the very end of the *Antiquities* in confirmation of the testimony of the passages we have taken from him. In fact, while he was attacking Justus⁸ of Tiberias, who like himself had attempted to write a work on the events of the same period, on the ground that he had not written truthfully, and after he had brought many other charges against the man, he went on with these very words:⁹ 'I certainly had no fear, like yourself,

5 4 Machabees.

6 Josephus, *A.I.* 20.268.

7 *Ibid.* 25 and 29; 3.94 and 143; 4.198; *B.J.* 5.23.1 and 247; *A.I.* 20.267.

8 A leader of one of the factions of that city just before the outbreak of the war, while Josephus was Governor of Galilee. He opposed Josephus constantly and caused him much trouble, attacking him severely in a treatise, no longer extant, on the Jewish war. It was because of this work that Josephus felt compelled to write his autobiography, which is really only his defense of himself against the attack of Justus.

9 Josephus, *De vita sua* 361-364.

about my own writing,¹⁰ but submitted the books to the emperors themselves, when the events were all but before their very eyes. For I was conscious of having maintained respect for truth, in confirmation of which I did not fail in my expectation of obtaining their testimony. I also submitted the history to many others, some of whom had actually taken part in the war, such as King Agrippa¹¹ and some of his relatives. And the Emperor Titus so earnestly desired to pass the knowledge of his deeds down to mankind from my books alone that he inscribed them with his own hand, and ordered them to be published, and King Agrippa wrote sixty-two letters testifying to their respect for truth.¹² Of these letters he appends two.¹² But let this suffice on Josephus; let us go on to subsequent matters.

Chapter 11

After the martyrdom of James¹ and the capture of Jerusalem which took place immediately,² a story maintains that those of the Apostles and of the disciples of the Lord who still remained in this life came together from all sides, along with

-
- 10 Justus did not publish his *History of the Jews* until after the deaths of Vespasian, Titus, and Agrippa, although he had completed it twenty years earlier. Josephus accuses him of postponing publication while the chief actors were still alive to challenge his remarks.
- 11 King Agrippa II (cf. above, 2. 19), who co-operated with the Romans and was with Vespasian and Titus during most of the war. He made repeated attempts to cause the people to give up their rebellion in order to avoid the war.
- 12 Josephus gives these two letters in his autobiography, immediately after the passage quoted here by Eusebius.

1 In 61 or 62; cf. above, 2.23.

2 Symeon succeeded James as Bishop of Jerusalem, probably after the destruction of the city. Eusebius (4.5) gives a list of the bishops of Jerusalem, but no information on the time of their accession or on the period of their incumbency.

those of the family of the Lord according to the flesh, for the majority of these still survived in this life at that time, all to take counsel together on whom they ought to judge worthy to succeed James; and all unanimously decided that Symeon³ the son of Clopas, whom the writings of the Gospel mentioned,⁴ was worthy of the throne of the diocese there. He was as they say, the cousin of the Saviour, for Hegesippus relates that Clopas was the brother of Joseph.⁵

Chapter 12

In addition, he also relates that after the capture of Jerusalem Vespasian ordered all those of the family of David to be sought out, in order that no one of the royal family might be left among the Jews, and for this reason a very great persecution was again inflicted upon the Jews.¹

Chapter 13

After Vespasian had reigned for ten years,¹ his son Titus

³ To be distinguished from the Apostle Simon the Canaanite, and from the Simon who is mentioned in Matt. 13.55 and Mark 6.3. On the martyrdom of Symeon, cf. Ch. 32.

⁴ Luke 24.18; John 19.25.

⁵ Hegesippus (as quoted below, 4.22) calls Clopas the uncle of the Lord. Apparently, Eusebius assumes from this that Clopas and Joseph were brothers.

¹ No other source mentions a persecution of the Jews by Vespasian. It could not have been very serious to have escaped other historical notice.

¹ From July 1 (when he was proclaimed emperor in Egypt) or December 20 (when Vitellius died), 69, to June 24, 79.

succeeded him as emperor. In the second year of his reign, Linus, Bishop of the Church at Rome, after holding his office for twelve years,² passed it on to Anencletus. And Titus, after reigning for two years and a like number of months, was succeeded by his brother, Domitian.³

Chapter 14

In the fourth year of Domitian, Annianus,¹ first Bishop of the diocese of Alexandria, after fulfilling twenty-two years, died and was succeeded by Abilius² as the second.

Chapter 15

In the twelfth year of the same reign, Clement succeeded Anencletus, who had been Bishop of the Church at Rome for twelve years. The Apostle, in his Epistle to the Philippians,¹ declares that he was his fellow worker, saying: 'With Clement and the rest of my fellow laborers, whose names are in the book of life.'

2 Linus' incumbency is given by Eusebius (*Chron.*) as fourteen years, and by Jerome as eleven years.

3 December 13, 81. Accordingly, he ruled two years and six months, and not two years and two months as stated here.

1 In 85; cf. above, 2.24.

2 One tradition (described in Smith and Wace) holds that Abilius and his successor Cerdon were ordained presbyters by Mark. Another tradition, according to *Ap. Const.* 7.46, states that Luke appointed Abilius bishop. Eusebius states (Ch. 21) that he held office for thirteen years.

1 Cf. Phil. 4.3. On Clement, cf. above, Chs. 2 and 4.

Chapter 16

Now, there is in circulation a recognized letter of this Clement,¹ long and wonderful,² which he composed in the name of the Church at Rome to the Church at Corinth, when a dissension³ had arisen at Corinth. We have learned that this letter has been used in public assembly in many churches both in olden days and in our own time.⁴ And that the affairs of Corinth were disturbed by dissension at the time mentioned is attested by a trustworthy witness, Hegesippus.

Chapter 17

When Domitian had displayed great cruelty toward many and had killed without fair trial no small number of well-born and famous men at Rome and had punished countless other notable men without cause by banishment to foreign lands and by confiscation of their property, he finally established himself as Nero's successor in hatred and hostility toward

1 This letter was probably written in the late first century, and is probably the very earliest of post-biblical works. It is ostensibly addressed to the Church at Corinth by the Church at Rome, and it bears the name of no author. Tradition, beginning with Dionysius of Corinth, as quoted by Eusebius (4.23), ascribes it to Clement, Bishop of Rome, and this tradition has essentially never been questioned. This letter has come down to us through two Greek Mss. and a Syriac version. We have possessed the epistle complete only since 1875. Previously, a portion of the fifty-nine chapters was missing. It is translated in *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. I of this series.

2 It enjoyed a very high reputation in the early Church, being regarded as canonical and a part of the New Testament on rare occasions.

3 This dissension occasioned the letter; cf. Chs. 1 and 3 of the letter itself.

4 Cf. Dionysius of Corinth, as quoted below, 4.23.

God. In fact, he was the second to promote a persecution against us,¹ although his father Vespasian contrived nothing unusual against us.²

Chapter 18

At this time, report has it that the Apostle and Evangelist John, who was still alive, was condemned to dwell on the Island of Patmos because of his testimony to the divine Word.¹ At any rate, Irenaeus, when writing about the number of the name of anti-Christ given in the so-called Apocalypse of John,² says the following about John in so many words in Book 5 of his *Against Heresies*: 'But if it had been necessary to proclaim his name openly, it would have been spoken by him who saw the apocalypse. For it was seen not long ago, but almost in our own generation, toward the end of the reign of Domitian.'³

To such an extent did the teaching of our faith flourish in the days just mentioned that even those authors who were far from our belief did not hesitate to hand down in their

1 The persecutions during the reigns of Nero and Domitian were not official acts of the state but personal affairs of these emperors themselves. The first systematic persecution of the Christians throughout the Roman Empire was under Decius (249-251). Domitian's cruelty, however, was intense; his persecution, because of his jealousy and for political reasons, was aimed at various groups and not Christians alone. According to Tertullian (*Apol.* 5), it was of short duration.

2 At least there is no tradition that Vespasian persecuted the Christians.

1 Tradition, beginning with Irenaeus, as quoted by Eusebius (5.8.30), unanimously places the banishment of John and the apocalyptic visions in the reign of Domitian. This has never been questioned until recent years, and not convincingly.

2 Cf. Apoc. 13.18.

3 Iren. 5.30.3.

writings the persecution and the martyrdoms in it,⁴ and they also indicated the time accurately, relating that Flavia Domitilla, who was the daughter of a sister of Flavius Clemens, one of the consuls at Rome at that time, was banished with many others in the fifteenth year of Domitian⁵ to the Island of Pontia for the sake of testimony to Christ.

Chapter 19

When the same Domitian ordered that those of the race of David be slain, an ancient story holds that some of the heretics accused the descendants of Jude (it was said that he was a brother of the Saviour, according to the flesh),¹ on the ground that they really were of the race of David and were related to Christ Himself. Hegesippus makes this clear when he speaks exactly as follows.²

4 Jerome (*Chronicon* of Eusebius for the year of Abraham 2112) speaks of the historian Bruttius as recording the martyrdom of many Christians under Domitian. But the works of Bruttius are not extant and so this cannot be verified. Cassius Dio (67.14) records certain banishments under Domitian, among them that of Flavia Domitilla who, we know, was a Christian. He himself mentions none of the victims as being Christian.

5 A.D. 96. Cf. Suetonius, *Dom.* 15, and Cassius Dio 67.14. There seems no doubt but that Flavia Domitilla was a Christian. In all probability Flavius Clemens was not. They both were in high favor with Domitian, the one being his niece and the other his cousin. Their two sons were even named heirs to the Empire, and Flavius Clemens was made the colleague to the emperor in the consulship. Soon after, however, Clemens was put to death and Domitilla was exiled.

1 This Jude was the brother of James, 'the brother of the Lord' mentioned in Jude 1. He is to be distinguished from Jude, one of the Twelve, mentioned in Luke 6.16 and Acts 1.13 as the son (although translated 'brother') of James.

2 Cf. Matt. 13.55; Mark 6.3.

Chapter 20

'There still survived of the race of the Lord grandsons of Judas who was said to have been His brother according to the flesh. Information was given against them that they were of the race of David. These the *evocatus*¹ brought before Domitian Caesar, for, like Herod, he feared the coming of Christ. He asked them if they were of the race of David, and they admitted it. Then he asked them how much property they owned, or how much money they possessed. And they said that between the two of them they had only 9,000 denarii,² half belonging to each of them, and they said repeatedly that they had this not in money but in a piece of land of only thirty-nine plethra,³ on which they paid taxes,⁴ and from which by working the ground themselves they obtained their livelihood.' Then they showed him their hands, exhibiting as evidence of their own labor the hardness of their bodies and the calluses produced on their hands from incessant work. And when they were asked about Christ and His kingdom, of what nature it was, and where, and when it would appear, they gave answer that it was neither of the world nor earthly, but heavenly and angelic, and would appear at the end of the world,⁵ when He would come in glory to judge the living and the dead and to give unto every one according to his works. Domitian did not condemn them for this, but looked down upon them as simple folk, let them go free, and by a decree put an end to the persecution against

1 A soldier who had served his time out and was later called upon to do duty as a volunteer, probably with an officer's rank.

2 A denarius was worth from sixteen to nineteen cents.

3 The Greek *plethron* equaled about a quarter of an acre, but it is used for the Latin *iugerum* which is more than half an acre.

4 Taxes were ordinarily paid in the products of the land.

5 Cf. Matt. 16:27; Acts 10:42; Rom. 2:6; 2 Tim. 4:1.

the Church. But when they were released they guided the churches, since they were witnesses and relatives of the Lord, and after peace was established they remained alive until the time of Trajan. So much for Hegesippus. Tertullian, moreover, has also made similar mention of Domitian: 'Domitian also once tried to do the same as Nero, being possessed of a part of Nero's cruelty. But, in my opinion, since he had some sense, he stopped immediately, even recalling those whom he had banished.'⁶

After Domitian had reigned for fifteen years and Nerva succeeded to the rule,⁷ the Roman Senate decreed⁸ that the sentences of Domitian be annulled and that those who had been banished unjustly return to their homes and receive back their property. Those who have committed the events of those times to writing relate this. The story of our ancient writers relates that at that time the Apostle John, after his exile to the island, took up his abode at Ephesus.

Chapter 21

Trajan¹ succeeded Nerva, who had reigned for a little more than a year. In the first year of Trajan, Cerdo² succeeded Abilius, who had headed the diocese of Alexandria for thirteen years. He was the third to preside over this diocese after the first, Annianus. At this time, Clement was still the

⁶ Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* 5.

⁷ September 18, 96.

⁸ Cf. Cassius Dio 68.1ff. and Suetonius, *Domitian* 23.

¹ January 27, 98.

² The legendary Acts of St. Mark name Cerdo as one of the presbyters ordained by Mark. Eusebius (*H.E.* 4.1 and *Chron.*) says that he reigned until the twelfth year of Trajan.

head of the Church at Rome, he, too, holding third place among those who had been bishop there after Peter and Paul. Linus was the first and after him Anencletus.

Chapter 22

Moreover, in the time mentioned, Ignatius became famous as the second Bishop at Antioch where Evodius¹ had first established the Church. Simeon likewise was the second, after our Saviour's brother, to hold the direction of the Church in Jerusalem.

Chapter 23

At this time, in Asia, that very disciple whom Jesus loved, at once both Apostle and Evangelist, was still alive and administered the churches there, having returned from his exile on the island after the death of Domitian.¹ It is enough to confirm the report that he still survived at this time² through two witnesses, and these should be trustworthy, for they represented the orthodoxy of the Church; such, indeed, were Irenaeus and Clement³ of Alexandria. The former of these, in Book 2 of his work *Against Heresies*, writes word for word as follows: 'And all the presbyters who had associated in Asia with John, the disciple of the Lord, attest to John's

1 Earliest tradition makes Evodius the first Bishop of Antioch (cf. Eusebius, *Chronicon*, for the year of Abraham 2058), and this tradition appears historical.

1 Cf. John 13.23; 19.26; 21.7,20.

2 At the beginning of the reign of Trajan.

3 Yet Clement VIII omits his name from the Martyrology on the ground that his orthodoxy was questionable.

tradition, for he remained with them until the times of Trajan.⁴ And in Book 3 of the same work he discloses this same fact in these words: 'Moreover, the Church at Ephesus, which was established by Paul and where John remained with them until the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the Apostles.'⁵

Clement likewise has indicated the time, and adds in his treatise entitled *Who Is the Rich Man Who Is Saved*,⁶ a most attractive story for those who enjoy hearing what is beautiful and profitable. Take up and read his account, which is somewhat as follows:⁷ 'Hear a story which is not a mere story but a narrative about John the Apostle which has been handed down and preserved in memory. When, after the death of the tyrant, he returned from the Island of Patmos to Ephesus, he used to go, on being invited, to the neighboring districts of the heathen,⁸ in some places to appoint bishops, in others to set whole churches in order, in others to ordain as priest some one of those indicated by the Spirit. Now, when he had come to one of the cities not far away, whose name even some people give,⁹ and had in general consoled the brethren, in the presence of all looking at the bishop who had been appointed and seeing a young man strong of body, beautiful in appearance, and warm of heart, he said: "This one I commit to thee with all diligence in the face of the Church and with Christ as

4 Iren. 2.22.5.

5 Iren. 3.3.5.

6 An excellent essay, full of common sense, still extant. An English version can be found in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 2.591-604.

7 Clement, *De divite serv.* 42.

8 The Greek word *ethnon* may here possibly mean 'country folk' as opposed to 'city folk.'

9 According to the *Chronicon Paschale* (470.9), the city in question here is Smyrna. Perhaps Clement withholds the name here out of deference for Polycarp, who, according to tradition, was appointed Bishop of Smyrna by John.

my witness." As the bishop received him and promised all, again he repeated the same words and called upon the same witnesses. Then John returned to Ephesus, and the presbyter¹⁰ took the young man who had been entrusted to him to his home, brought him up, kept him, looked after him, and finally baptized¹¹ him. After this, he relaxed his great care and watchfulness, inasmuch as he had placed upon him as the perfect safeguard the seal of the Lord.¹² But some youths, idle and dissolute and accustomed to evil, corrupted him as he enjoyed his premature freedom. First, they enticed him with costly feasts; then, when they set out at night for robbery, they took him with them; then they urged him to join them in a greater crime. Gradually, he became accustomed to this, and because of his great natural vigor,¹³ like a hard-mouthed and powerful horse setting out from the straight way and tearing at the bit, he rushed the more violently down the depths. Finally, despairing of salvation in God, he no longer planned something small, but having committed a great crime, since he was ruined once and for all, he expected to suffer the same fate as the others. Now, gathering them together and forming a band of brigands, he became a bold bandit chief, pre-eminent in violence, in murder, and in

10 The same man is called bishop just above. There undoubtedly was some distinction in the early period of the Church between presbyters and bishops. Several theories on the distinction have been set forth. Many passages, however, may be adduced to demonstrate an identity of meanings for the two terms. At the moment, this problem has not been entirely solved. Cf. Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*; also, *Catholic Encyclopaedia* 2.582; 7.327; 9.594; 12.406a.

11 The Greek word *ephotise* means 'to enlighten.' It was commonly used by the Greek Fathers in the sense of 'to baptize.'

12 The Greek expression, *ten sphragida kuriou*, 'the seal of the Lord,' was regularly used in the early Church to denote baptism.

13 The Greek expression, *megethos physeos*, is, literally, 'greatness of nature.'

cruelty. Time passed on, and, when necessity arose, they summoned John. When he had set in order the other matters for which he had come, John said: "Come now, bishop, pay us back the deposit which I and Christ committed to you with the church over which you preside as witness." The bishop at first was amazed, thinking that he was being blackmailed for money which he had never received, and he was able neither to show his faithfulness in what he did not possess nor to distrust John. But when John said: "I demand back the young man and the soul of the brother," the old man groaned deeply and, bursting into tears, said: "He has died." "How and by what death?" "He has died to God," he said, "for he turned out wicked and abandoned and, in short, a robber. Now, instead of to the church, he has taken to the mountains with a band of men like himself." The Apostle rent his clothes and with great lamentation beat his head. "A fine guard," he said, "did I leave for the soul of our brother. But, now, let a horse be furnished me, and let someone show me the way." So he rode, just as he was, straight from the church. And when he came to the place he was captured by the outpost of the robbers, and neither fled nor made entreaties, but shouted: "For this I have come, take me to your leader." The leader, meanwhile, armed as he was, awaited him, and when he recognized John as he approached he turned to flight in shame. But John pursued with all his might, forgetting his own age and crying out: "Why, child, do you flee me, your own father, unarmed and old? Pity me, child; have no fear. You still have hope of life. I shall give an account for you to Christ. If need be, I shall willingly endure your death, just as the Lord did for us. I shall give up my life for you. Stop, believe. Christ has sent me." And he, on hearing this, at first stood still looking down; then he tore off his weapons; then, trembling, he wept bitterly. He

embraced the old man as he approached, apologizing for himself with tears as he was able, and with his tears baptizing himself a second time, concealing only his right hand. But John pledged and swore that he had found forgiveness for him with the Saviour. Beseeching him, he knelt and kissed his right hand as if it had been cleansed by repentance, and he brought him back to the church. Interceding for him with copious prayers, he joined with him in the struggle of continuous fasting, and subdued his mind by various binding arguments, and he did not depart, as it was said, until he had restored him to the church, giving a great example of true repentance and a great testimony of regeneration, a trophy of a visible resurrection.¹⁴ I have made this quotation from Clement here both for the sake of the narrative and for its benefit to my readers.

Chapter 24

But, come, let us point out the irrefutable writings of this Apostle.¹ Let the Gospel according to him, which is read in all the churches under heaven, be first recognized.² That it has with good reason been listed by the ancients in the fourth place after the other three may be made evident as follows. Those inspired and truly divine men, I mean the Apostles of Christ, had completely purified their life, and had adorned their souls with every virtue, but they were unskilled in

14 Cf. George Syncellus 653.12-654.16.

¹ John.

² The authenticity of the Gospel of St. John was never seriously questioned until the rise of the so-called Tuebingen school in the nineteenth century. All ancient testimony, orthodox and heretical, supports it. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.* 8.439a.

speech.³ Although they indeed had confidence in the divine and wonder-working power granted them by the Saviour, they neither knew how nor desired to proclaim the doctrines of their teacher in persuasive and artistic language,⁴ but they used only the proof of the divine Spirit that worked with them, and the wonder-working power of Christ which was brought to fulfillment through them. Thus they proclaimed the knowledge of the kingdom of heaven to the whole world, and gave little consideration to care in composing written words. And they did this because they were serving a greater and superhuman ministry. At any rate, Paul, the most able of all in the handling of language and the most vigorous in thought, put in writing no more than the briefest Epistles,⁵ although he was able to express countless ineffable things,⁶ for he had touched the vision of the third heaven and had been caught up to the divine paradise itself and had been thought worthy of hearing ineffable words there. Now, the other pupils of our Saviour were not without experience in the same things—the twelve Apostles, the seventy disciples, and countless others in addition to these. Yet, of all these, only Matthew and John have left us recollections of the conversations of the Lord, and tradition has it that they took to writing by force. For Matthew, who had first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go among others, by committing the Gospel according to himself to writings in his

³ Cf. Acts 4.13; 2 Cor. 11.

⁴ Cf. 1 Cor. 2.4.

⁵ Origen, as quoted by Eusebius (6.25). Eusebius here seems to imply that St. Paul wrote only the Epistles now extant under his name. It is difficult to say whether or not this is true, but it does indicate the thought of the early Church on the question.

⁶ Cf. 2 Cor. 12.2-4.

native language,⁷ compensated by his writing for the lack of his presence those from whom he was being sent. And Mark and Luke had already given out the Gospels⁸ according to themselves, but it is said that John all the same made use of an unwritten message, and finally resorted to writing for the following reason. When the three Gospels which had been written before had been distributed among all including himself, it is said that he accepted them and bore witness to their truth, but said that there was only lacking in the writing the description of what was done by Christ in the first days and at the beginning of His preaching.⁹ And the statement is indeed true. It is at least possible to see that the three Evangelists described only what the Saviour had accomplished in the one year after John the Baptist was confined to prison¹⁰ and that they made this very point at the beginning of their narrative. Anyhow, after the fast of forty days and the temptation following upon this, Matthew shows the

7 The prevailing opinion among scholars today is that Matthew wrote a Gospel in Hebrew. This is probable and is supported by patristic tradition; cf. Papias (quoted by Eusebius, Ch. 39); Irenaeus (3.1.1; cf. also Eusebius 5.8.2); Origen (cf. Eusebius 6.25); Pantaenus (cf. Eusebius 5.10); Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 3); and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 29.9). The relation of the Hebrew to the Greek is still a question, but conservative opinion holds that the two are distinct works.

8 On Luke, cf. above, Ch. 4; on Mark, above, 2.15.

9 Eusebius is the first to give this reason for the writing of the Gospel of St. John. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 9) repeats this view, adding an antiheretical purpose. While it is true that the Gospel of St. John supplements and completes the accounts of the Synoptists, its real purpose is much higher, that his children may believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and that believing may have life eternal in His Name (1 John 5.13; John 20.31). Cf. *Cath. Encycl.* 8.437b.

10 The Synoptic Gospels give the impression that Christ's ministry on earth lasted for but a year, and many of the early Fathers (Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, and others) so believed. But St. John mentions three and possibly four Passovers, and so it must have continued for two or three years.

time of his own writing by saying: 'Having heard John had been betrayed, he retired from Judaea into Galilee,'¹¹ and Mark likewise says: 'After John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee.'¹² And Luke also, before beginning the acts of Jesus, similarly observes, saying that Herod added to the evil deeds which he had done, and 'shut up John in prison.'¹³ Thus they say that the Apostle John was asked for this reason to hand down in his own Gospel an account of the period passed over in silence by the former Evangelists and of the things done at this time by the Saviour (and those were what He did before the imprisonment of the Baptist), and that he pointed this out when he said on one occasion, 'this beginning of miracles did Jesus,'¹⁴ and on another occasion, by mentioning the Baptist in the midst of the acts of Jesus as then still baptizing in Enon near Salim, and that he makes this clear by saying, 'for John was not yet cast into prison.'¹⁵ Thus John hands down by the writing of his own Gospel the things which were done by Christ when the Baptist had not yet been thrown under guard, and the other three Evangelists relate the events after the casting of the Baptist into prison. To one who has grasped this, the Gospels no longer appear to be at variance with one another, because that according to John includes the first of the acts of Christ, and the others the story of what He did at the end of the period, and because John then probably passed over the genealogy of our Saviour inasmuch as it had already been described by Matthew and Luke, and he began with His divinity since it had been reserved for him by the Divine Spirit as for one greater than they.

11 Cf. Matt. 4.12.

12 Mark 1.14.

13 Luke 3.19,20.

14 John 2.11.

15 John 3.23,24.

Let so much suffice for us regarding the writing of the Gospel according to John, and the reason for that according to Mark has been made clear above.¹⁶ Luke himself has also set forth, as he began his account, the reason why he made his composition, pointing out that, since many others had attempted rather rashly to form a narrative of the matters of which he himself had full knowledge,¹⁷ to relieve us of the doubtful opinions of others he of necessity through his own Gospel handed down the accurate account of those events of which he himself had well grasped the truth, aided by his association and life with Paul and by his intercourse with the other Apostles.¹⁸ So much do we present on these matters at this time, but on a more fitting occasion we will try to show by quotations from the ancients what has been said by others concerning them.

Of the writings of John besides the Gospel, the first of the Epistles is acknowledged without controversy by men of today as well as by the ancients,¹⁹ but the other two are disputed,²⁰ and opinion on the Apocalypse²¹ with most persons even

16 Cf. 2.15.

17 The Greek word (*peplerophoreto*) here has always puzzled translators. Eusebius seems to think that Luke was calling attention to his 'full' knowledge in contrast to the imperfect knowledge of his predecessors.

18 Cf. Luke 1.1-4. Eusebius does not follow Luke carefully here. He may be said to interpret the meaning of Luke's words and not to falsify them, as some critics have accused him of doing.

19 The authenticity of the Gospel and Epistles of St. John were never questioned until in the early nineteenth century. They all stand or fall together. The evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of their authenticity.

20 Eusebius is careful not to state his own opinion here. He gives merely the thought of the men of his time.

21 Probably the best authenticated book of the New Testament. From tradition we know that the Seer in the Apocalypse was John the Apostle, the son of Zebedee, the Beloved Disciple of Jesus. As early as the end of the second century the Apocalypse was recognized by the historical representatives of the principal churches as the genuine work of John the Apostle. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.* 1.594.

today tends in either direction. However, at the proper time, this also will receive consideration from the testimony of the ancients.²²

Chapter 25

It seems reasonable, having arrived at this point, to summarize¹ the writings of the New Testament which have been mentioned. First, we must put the holy quaternity of the Gospels,² and the writing of the Acts of the Apostles³ follows these. After this we must reckon the Epistles of Paul.⁴ Next to these in order we must recognize the Epistle of John called the first and similarly the Epistle of Peter.⁵ After these, if it seem well, we must place the Apocalypse of John,⁶ the arguments concerning which we will set forth at the proper time. These are among the recognized books. Among the disputed works, but yet known to most, are extant the so-called Epistle of James, that of Jude, the second Epistle of Peter, and the so-called second and third Epistle of John,⁷ whether they really belong to the Evangelist or even to another of the same name. Among the spurious works must be

22 Cf. below, 6.25, where Eusebius quotes Dionysius of Alexandria at length; also opinions in support of the authenticity of the Apocalypse by Justin (4.18), Theophilus (4.24), Irenaeus (5.8), and Origen (6.25).

1 It must be remembered, especially here, that Eusebius speaks as an historian, giving the opinion of the Church of his time. He is not a critic and does not attempt to solve literary problems.

2 On Matthew, cf. 3.24; on Mark, 2.15; on Luke 3.4; on John, 3.24.

3 Cf. 3.4.

4 Cf. 3.3.

5 On John, cf. 3.24; on Peter, 3.3.

6 Cf. 3.24.

7 On James and Jude, cf. 2.23; on Peter, 3.3; on John, 3.24.

placed the work of the Acts of Paul and the so-called Shepherd, and the Apocalypse of Peter,⁸ and in addition to these the extant letter of Barnabas⁹ and the so-called Teachings of the Apostles,¹⁰ and again, as I have said, the Apocalypse of John, if it should so appear. Some, as I have said, reject it, but others classify it among the accepted books. Now, among these some have also placed the Gospel according to the Hebrews,¹¹ in which the Hebrews who have accepted Christ especially delight. All these might be among the disputed books, but we have nevertheless, of necessity, made a list of them, distinguishing those writings which according to the tradition of the Church are true, genuine, and recognized from those which are different from these in that they are not canonical but disputed, although known by most of the writers of the Church, in order that we might be able to know these works themselves and the writings which are published by the heretics under the name of the Apostles,

8 On these three works, cf. 3.3.

9 The author is unknown, but a rather weak patristic tradition ascribes it to Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul. Tertullian also ascribes (probably falsely) the Epistle to the Hebrews to this same Barnabas. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.* 2.300. For an English version of this work, cf. *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. 1 of this series.

10 A brief document in sixteen chapters, discovered by Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia in Constantinople, in 1873, and later published by him. It throws much new light on the earliest history of the Church, and also raises many new questions. It was clearly in circulation before the end of the first century. Some would name Egypt as its place of origin. For an English version of this work, cf. *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. 1 of this series.

11 Probably composed in Hebrew, and except for a few fragments, no longer extant. Mentioned also by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and St. Epiphanius; often associated with St. Matthew's Gospel, but not our Greek canonical Matthew. Twenty-four fragments have been preserved by ecclesiastical writers. Although this material is outside the canon, it had its beginning in primitive tradition but it has been contaminated in the interests of a Judaizing Church. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.* 1.608.

including Gospels such as those of Peter¹² and Thomas¹³ and Matthias,¹⁴ and some others besides these, or Acts such as those of Andrew¹⁵ and John¹⁶ and the other Apostles. To none of these has anyone belonging to the succession of the writers of the Church considered it right to refer in his writings. Furthermore, the character of the phraseology is at variance with apostolic style, and both the thought and the purpose of what is related in them is especially in discord with true orthodoxy and clearly proves that they really are forgeries by heretics. They ought, therefore, to be placed not even among spurious works, but should be shunned as altogether absurd and impious.

Chapter 26

Let us now go with the succeeding narrative. Menander,¹ who succeeded Simon Magus,² displayed a character,

12 Cf. above, 3.3.

13 Mentioned frequently by the Fathers, beginning with Origen, but always as an heretical work. It was written in the second century and is of Gnostic origin. For an English version, cf. *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 8.395-405.

14 No longer extant except for fragments, quoted by Clement of Alexandria, which reveal that it stressed asceticism. It is mentioned earliest by Origen (*Hom. in Lucam* 1), and by Jerome (*Praef. in Matt.*), and is probably of Gnostic origin.

15 Eusebius appears to be the first author to refer to those Acts. They are, however, mentioned later by Epiphanius, Philaster, and Augustine, and are of Gnostic origin. For an English version, cf. *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 8.517-525.

16 Likewise apparently mentioned first by Eusebius. They are Gnostic in origin and had a wide circulation in antiquity. For an English version, cf. *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 8.560-564.

1 A Samaritan false teacher and a disciple of Simon Magus, who deceived many by his magic arts. All our knowledge of him is derived directly or indirectly from Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1.26,56); cf. also, *Iren.* 1.23.5.

2 Cf. above, 2.13.

no worse than his predecessor, as an instrument of the Devil's power.³ He, too, was a Samaritan, who had advanced to a high knowledge of sorcery no less than his teacher, and he abounded in greater wonders. He said that he himself was the saviour sent from above from invisible aeons⁴ for the salvation of men,⁵ and he taught that no one, not even of the angels themselves who made the world,⁶ could survive unless first led through the discipline of magic imparted by him and through the baptism dispensed by him, and that those who were thought worthy of this would share in eternal immortality in this life itself, no longer subject to death, but that abiding here forever they would be ageless and immortal.⁷ It is easy to learn all this from the works of Irenaeus.⁸ Justin, too, after making mention of Simon, in the same place adds also the story of this man by saying:⁹ 'And we know that a certain Menander, himself also a Samaritan from the village

3 'An instrument of the devil's power' is a contribution of Eusebius, and characteristic of his treatment of heretics.

4 The Greek (*ainon*) literally means 'age.' In ecclesiastical Greek, however, it sometimes, as here, means the supernatural beings who are a part of Gnostic theology.

5 According to Irenaeus (1.23.1,5), Simon professed himself to be the Supreme Power, but Menander taught that the Supreme Power is still unknown to all, but, as Eusebius says, he himself was sent as the saviour and deliverer of mankind.

6 Both Menander and Simon taught that the world was made by angels, who had their origin from the *ennoea* of the Supreme Power, and that by their magical powers they were able to overcome these creative angels.

7 This baptism and the resultant immortality were a contribution from Menander. This exemption from death, as taught by Menander, was taken in its physical and literal sense by Irenaeus, Tertullian (*De anima* 50), but Menander almost certainly placed a spiritual meaning upon it. The sect did not continue very long, but flourished in the time of Justin.

8 Cf. *Adv. haer.* 1.23.5. Eusebius (3.4.3) calls Menander the father of all the Gnostics.

9 *Apol.* 1.26.

of Caparattaea,¹⁰ was a disciple of Simon, and he, too, being stimulated by the demons, came to Antioch and deceived many by his art of magic. And he persuaded his followers that they would not die and there are some of his followers today who assert this.'

Surely it was of the work of the Devil to attempt, through such sorcerers who assumed the name of Christians, to defame the great mystery of religion by magic and through them to destroy the teachings of the Church on the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the dead.¹¹ But those who have endorsed these men as saviours have fallen from the true hope.

Chapter 27

The wicked demon, however, when he was unable to shake certain others from God's plan in Christ, made them his own when he found them susceptible otherwise. The early Christians appropriately called these people Ebionites¹ because

¹⁰ Its location is not known with certainty.

¹¹ Eusebius apparently regarded the Meandrianists as ridiculing the Christian doctrine of a resurrection by teaching a physical immortality. According to Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 18.1), however, they denied a physical resurrection and taught, rather, a spiritual immortality.

¹ One or more early Christian sects afflicted with Judaistic error. The word itself is a transliteration of the Hebrew, meaning 'poor man.' The name appears first in Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1.26.2), then in Origen (*Contra Celsum* 2.1; *De princ.* 4.1.22), and here in Eusebius. These writers refer the name to the poverty of their understanding, or to the poor opinions which they held regarding Christ. Obviously, this is not a true explanation. Other writers, e.g., Tertullian (*De Praescr.* 33; *De carne Chr.* 14.18) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 23), derive the name from their supposed founder, Ebion. All evidence to support this assumption is very weak. The name may have been assumed by those who wished to claim the beatitude of being poor in spirit or who professed to live according to the example of the first Christians in Jerusalem, who laid their goods at the feet of the Apostles. Others may have applied the name because of the notorious poverty of the Christians in

they held poor and mean opinions concerning Christ. They considered Him to be a plain and ordinary man who was justified only by the superiority of His character and who was born from intercourse between a man and Mary. According to them, there was absolute need of the ceremonial law on the ground that they would not be saved by faith in Christ alone and a life according to it. But others besides these, who had the same name,² avoided the outlandish folly of those just mentioned in that they did not deny that the Lord was born of a Virgin and the Holy Spirit; yet, by agreeing with them in not confessing that He pre-existed³ as God,

Palestine; cf. Gal. 2.10. It has been maintained rather reasonably by some that originally the term was not applied to any heretical sect but only to the orthodox Jewish Christians of Palestine who continued to observe the Mosaic Law. Since these were not in close touch with the rest of the Christian world, they gradually drifted away from the standard of orthodoxy and became formal heretics. For a stage in this evolution, cf. Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* 47, where two groups of Jewish Christians estranged from the Church are mentioned. One group observed the Mosaic Law for themselves but did not require others to do so; the other considered it obligatory for all. These last were regarded as heretical by everyone, but Justin would hold communion with the former, although not all Christians of the time were so inclined. The term Ebionites, however, is not used by St. Justin; it first occurs in 175, and then designates a definitely heretical sect. The chief teachings of the Ebionites may be summed up as follows. They denied the divinity and the virginal birth of Christ. They clung to the observance of the Jewish Law. They looked upon St. Paul as an apostate, and used only a Gospel according to Matthew. Cf. Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1.26.2; 3.21.2; 4.32.4; 5.1.3); Hippolytus (*Philos.* 8.22; 10.18); and Tertullian (*De carne Chr.* 14.18). Origen (*Contra Cels.* 5.61) is the first to distinguish the two classes of Ebionites, as Eusebius does here. While some Ebionites accept and others reject the virginal birth of Christ, all reject His pre-existence and His divinity. In addition to these Judaistic Ebionites, there was a later Gnostic development of the same heresy. On the general subject of the Ebionites, cf. *Cath. Encycl.* 5.242.

- 2 While Eusebius recognizes the two classes of Ebionites, he does not admit any distinction in name, such as Nazarinés and Ebionites, the former being applied to the milder and more conservative Ebionites. Origen, whom Eusebius follows, knows of no such difference in name.
- 3 All Ebionites were of one mind in denying Christ's pre-existence and essential divinity. To the Fathers, from Irenaeus on, this constituted the essence of their heresy.

being the Word and Wisdom, they were involved in the impiety of the former, especially when, like them, they endeavored to observe strictly the bodily worship of the Law.⁴ These thought that the Epistles of the Apostle ought to be rejected entirely, calling him an apostate from the Law,⁵ and, while making use alone of the Gospel according to the Hebrews,⁶ they made small account of the rest. They observed the sabbath and the rest of the discipline of the Jews just like them, but on Sundays they performed ceremonies like ours in commemoration of the Lord's Resurrection. Therefore, because of such practices they received their name, since the name of Ebionites signifies the poverty of their understanding, for the poor man is called by this name among the Hebrews.

Chapter 28

In the aforesaid period we have learned that Cerinthus¹

4 The distinction in the Ebionites, according to their observance of the Laws, as made by Justin, does not seem to be known to Eusebius.

5 Cf. Irenaeus 1.26.2, and Origen *Cont. Cels.* 5.65 and *Hom. in Jer.* 18.12. The attitude of the Ebionites toward St. Paul and their observance of the Jewish law fell into the background as their Christological heresy became more prominent.

6 Cf. above, 3.25 n. 11.

1 Cerinthus was an Egyptian and probably a Jew, the exact dates of whose birth and death are unknown. His teachings were a mixture of Gnosticism, Judaism, Chiliasm, and Ebionitism. He professed one Supreme Being, but declared that the world was produced by a distinct and far inferior power, not to be identified with the Jehovah of the Old Testament. Not Jehovah but the angels both made the world and gave the Law, and these angels were unaware of the existence of the Supreme God. Salvation was to be obtained by obedience to the precepts of the Jewish Law. Furthermore, Cerinthus distinguished between Jesus and Christ. Jesus, although pre-eminent for holiness, was only a man. He suffered, died, and was raised from the dead. Some say that Cerinthus taught He will be raised from the dead on the Last Day together with all men. At the moment of baptism, Christ

became the founder of another heresy. Gaius,² whose words we have already quoted above, in the inquiry which is attributed to him, writes as follows about him:³ 'Moreover, Cerinthus also through revelations, as if described by a great apostle, lyingly introduced portents to us, supposedly shown him by angels, saying that after the resurrection the kingdom of Christ will be on earth and that again the flesh dwelling in Jerusalem will be subject to desires and pleasures. And being an enemy of the Scriptures of God and wishing to deceive, he says the period of the marriage feast⁴ will be a thousand years.'⁵

And Dionysius,⁶ he who in our time held the bishopric of the diocese of Alexandria, in Book 2 of his *Promises* where he is making some remarks about the Apocalypse of John as though from ancient tradition, recalls the same man with these words: 'Cerinthus, who founded a heresy named after him, wished to attack a name worthy of credit to his own invention; for the doctrine of his teaching was this, that the kingdom of Christ would be upon earth, and, being fond of the body and very indulgent of the flesh, he dreamed that

or the Holy Spirit was sent by the Highest God to dwell in Jesus and to teach Him the Unknown God, which not even the angels knew. This union between Jesus and Christ continued until the Passion, when Jesus alone suffered and Christ returned to heaven. As a Chiliast, Cerinthus also believed in a happy millenium to be realized here on earth before the resurrection and the spiritual kingdom of God in heaven. Little is known about the disciples of Cerinthus. They seem to have disappeared early by fusion with the Ebionites and to have exerted little influence on the main body of Christendom. They flourished chiefly in Asia and Galatia.

² Cf. above, 2.25.

³ Cf. Apoc. 20.4-6.

⁴ It is generally believed from this passage that Gaius rejected the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse and considered it a work of Cerinthus. Gaius probably means simply that Cerinthus deliberately misinterpreted the vision of the Apocalypse for his own sensual purpose.

⁵ Cf. Apoc. 20.4; also, 3.39, below.

⁶ On Dionysius and his writings, cf. below, 6.40.

the kingdom would consist of those things which he desired, namely, the surfeiting of the belly and of the things of the belly, that is, eating and drinking and marrying and those things by which he thought these things would be provided more auspiciously, feasts and sacrifices and the slaughter of victims.⁷

So much from Dionysius. And Irenaeus has set forth in Book 1 of his work *Against Heresies* some of the more unspeakable errors of the man,⁷ and in Book 3 he has committed a story to writing which deserves to be remembered, telling how, according to a tradition of Polycarp, John the Apostle once entered a bathhouse to wash, and when he learned that Cerinthus was within leapt out of the place and fled out of the door, for he could not endure to be even under the same roof with him, and he urged those with him to do the same, saying: 'Let us flee, lest the bathhouse cave in, for Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within.'⁸

Chapter 29

At this time, also, there existed for a very short time the so-called heresy of the Nicolaitans of which the Apocalypse of John makes mention.¹ These boasted of Nicolaus, one of the deacons with Stephen chosen by the Apostles for the

⁷ Cf. *Adv. haer.* 1.26.1.

⁸ Cf. *Adv. haer.* 3.3.4. This story is very common among the early Fathers, and is repeated for several different persons. While there is nothing improbable about it, it is based on no reliable evidence.

¹ Cf. Apoc. 2.6,15; Acts 6.5. There seems to be no trustworthy evidence of the continuance of this sect after the death of John. In fact, all accounts of the Nicolaitans seem to stem ultimately from the material of the Apocalypse. The story of their licentiousness assumes great proportions as the account of the Apocalypse is retold.

service to the poor. Clement of Alexandria in Book 3 of the *Stromata* relates the following about him word for word:² "They say that this man had a beautiful wife, and when, after the ascension of the Saviour, he was accused of jealousy by the Apostles, he brought her forth and gave permission to any who wished to mate with her. They say that this action was in accord with the injunction "it is necessary to abuse the flesh," and following up what was done and what was said simply and without question those who follow this heresy commit fornication without restraint. But I learn that Nicolaus had nothing to do with any other woman besides her whom he married, and that of his children the daughters lived until an advanced age as virgins, and that the son remain uncorrupted. Since this is so, the exposure of his wife of whom he was jealous in the midst of the Apostles was an abandonment of passion, and teaching the abuse of the flesh was continence from pleasures that are eagerly sought. For he did not wish, I think, according to the command of the Saviour to serve two masters: pleasure and the Lord. Now, they say that Matthew³ also taught this, to fight the flesh and abuse it, in no wise giving way to it for pleasure, but to make the soul grow through faith and knowledge.' Let this suffice about those who in the aforesaid times attempted to pervert the truth, yet completely disappeared more quickly than it takes time to tell.

Chapter 30

Now, Clement, whose words we have just quoted, after what has already been mentioned, with respect to those who

² Cf. Clement, *Strom.* 3.25.26.

³ Cf. Matt. 6.24; Luke 16.13.

reject marriage gives a list of the Apostles who were known to have been married, saying:¹ 'Or will they disapprove even the Apostles? For Peter and Philip begot children, and Philip, too, gave his daughters to husbands, and Paul² does not hesitate in an Epistle to address his wife, whom he did not take about with him that he might facilitate his ministry.' Since we have mentioned these matters, there is no harm in my presenting another narrative of the same author, which he wrote down in Book 7 of the *Stromata*, relating it in the following way: 'They say, indeed, that the blessed Peter, when he beheld his wife being led away to death, rejoiced because of her calling and return home, and called out to her very encouragingly and comfortingly, addressing her by name, "O thou, remember the Lord." Such was the marriage of the blessed and the perfect disposition of those dearest to them.'³ Let these matters germane to the subject at hand suffice on my part for the moment at this point.

Chapter 31

Now, the time and the manner of the death of Paul and of Peter, and in addition the place of the disposition of their corpses after their departure from this life, we have already shown.¹ The date of the death of John has also already been mentioned,² and the disposition of his body is indicated by a

1 Clement, *Strom.* 3.52,53.

2 Cf. Phil. 4.3; 1 Cor. 9.5,13.

3 Clement, *Strom.* 7.63,64.

1 Cf. above, 2.25.

2 Cf. above, 3.23. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.22.5, is quoted here to show that John lived until the reign of Trajan.

letter of Polycrates³ (he was Bishop of the diocese of Ephesus), on writing which to Victor, Bishop of Rome, he makes mention both of John and Philip the Apostle, and the latter's daughters as follows: 'For in Asia also great luminaries have fallen asleep, who will rise again on the last day of the advent of the Lord, when He shall come with glory from heaven and shall search out all the saints including Philip⁴ of the twelve Apostles, who sleeps at Hierapolis⁵ with his two daughters who grew old as virgins and another daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit and rests at Ephesus. And there is also John,⁶ who leaned upon the bosom of the Lord, who was a priest wearing the mitre,⁷ and a martyr and a teacher, and he sleeps at Ephesus.'⁸ So much concerning their deaths. And in the dialogue of Gaius, which we mentioned a little before,⁹ Proclus,¹⁰ against whom he composed the disputation, thus speaks about the death of Philip and his daughters, agreeing¹¹

3 On Polycrates and Victor, cf. below, 5.22. This Epistle is the only extant work of Polycrates. This passage, but with much more of the context, is quoted below, 5.24.

4 Polycrates probably confuses Philip the Apostle and Philip the Deacon here, and Eusebius does not seem to notice it. They were clearly two different men, as is evident from Acts 6.2-5; 8.14-17; and 29.8. It seems fairly certain that the deacon and not the Apostle was buried at Hierapolis.

5 In Proconsular Asia, five miles north of Laodicea; cf. Col. 4.13. We can see extensive ruins of the city today, whose site is occupied by the modern village of Pambouk Kelessi.

6 John 13.25; 21.20.

7 The Greek word is *petalon*, used in the Septagint technically for the 'plate' or 'diadem' of the High Priest; cf. Exod. 28. Its meaning here is uncertain.

8 Cf. Exod. 28.32-34; Lev. 8.9; Matt. 18.18. On John's activity at Ephesus and his death there, cf. above, 3.1.

9 Cf. above, 2.25 and 3.28.

10 A Montanist leader; cf. above, 2.25.

11 The two accounts, as a matter of fact, differ in details, and it is difficult to understand why Eusebius passes over them. Perhaps he considered it his duty as a historian to give the two accounts accurately side by side and thus to permit the reader to draw his own conclusion. He certainly was not trying to deceive.

with what has already been set forth: 'After him the four daughters of Philip, prophetesses, were at Hierapolis in Asia. Their grave is there, and likewise that of their father.' So much does he say. And Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, mentions the daughters of Philip as then living in Caesarea of Judaea together with their father and as having been deemed worthy of the gift of prophecy, using exactly the following words: 'We came into Caesarea, and having entered the house of Philip who was one of the seven, we remained with him. He had four virgin daughters who were prophetesses.'¹²

Thus, after having described the matters that have come to our knowledge about the Apostles and apostolic times and concerning the sacred writings which they have left us, including those which are disputed, yet are read publicly by many in a great many churches, and those entirely spurious works at variance with apostolic orthodoxy, let us now proceed with the narrative in order.

Chapter 32

Report holds that after Nero and Domitian, under that emperor whose times we are now reviewing,¹ persecution was raised against us sporadically among the cities as a result of insurrection among the people. In this persecution we have learned that Symeon, the son of Clopas, whom we have shown to have been the second Bishop of the Church at Jerusalem,² gave up his life by martyrdom. Witness of this is

12 Cf. Acts 21.8.9. Eusebius evidently considers Philip the Apostle and Philip the Deacon identical.

1 Trajan, who reigned from 98 to 117.

2 Cf. above, §.11.

that very Hegisippus of whom we have already quoted various passages.³ When relating about certain heretics, he goes on to show that Symeon was accused by them at this time, and was tortured in many ways for a great many days because he was clearly a Christian, and he astonished to the highest degree both the judge himself and those with him, and won for himself an end similar to the Passion of the Lord.⁴ But there is nothing like listening to the historian who relates these facts exactly as follows: 'Some of these, clearly the heretics, accused Simon, the son of Clopas, on the ground that he was a descendant of David⁵ and a Christian,⁶ and so he suffered martyrdom when he was a hundred and twenty years of age,⁷ while Trajan was emperor and Atticus⁸ governor.' The same author says that it happened that, when the Jews who were of the royal house were sought out, 'his very accusers were arrested for being of that family.' And one might say with reason that Symeon was one of those who saw and heard the Lord, taking as evidence the length of his life and the fact that the writings of the Gospels make mention of Mary, the wife of Clopas, from whom the narrative has already shown him to have been born.

The same historian says that other descendants of one of the so-called brothers of the Saviour, Jude by name, lived until the same reign after giving testimony of their faith in

3 On his life and writings, cf. below, 4.8. He is quoted by Eusebius in 2.23 and 3.20 and is mentioned in 3.11.

4 I.e., crucifixion.

5 The members of the Jewish royal family were looked upon with great suspicion as possible leaders of revolution.

6 In the eyes of the Roman state, Christianity itself was a crime.

7 The actual date of the martyrdom is quite uncertain, although it is commonly placed in the year 106 or 107, on the basis Eusebius' *Chron.* Eusebius, however, is here bringing together events which took place in the reign of Trajan but whose exact dates he does not know.

8 The dates of his governorship are unknown.

Christ, as has already been related,⁹ in the time of Domitian. He writes thus: 'They came, therefore, and presided over every church as witnesses¹⁰ and as descendants of the family of the Lord, and when there was solid peace in every church, they remained until the Emperor Trajan,¹¹ until the time when the son of Lord's uncle,¹² the aforementioned Simon, the son of Clopas, himself was maligned and similarly accused by the heretical sects on the very same charge before the governor Atticus. He was tortured for many days and suffered martyrdom, so that all, including the governor, marveled how at the age of one hundred and twenty years he had endured, and he was ordered to be crucified.'

Besides this, the same man, when relating the events of these times, adds that until then the Church had remained a pure and undefiled virgin, since those who attempted to corrupt the sound rule of the Saviour's preaching, if any did exist, until then lurked somewhere in obscure darkness. But when the sacred band of the Apostles had received an end of life in various ways, and that generation of those who were deemed worthy to hear the divine wisdom with their own ears had passed away, then the league of godless error took its beginnings because of the deceit of heretical teachers¹³ who, since none of the Apostles still remained, attempted henceforth barefacedly to proclaim in opposition to the preaching of truth 'the knowledge falsely so-called.'¹⁴

9 Cf. John 19:25; also, above, 3.11.

10 The Greek word *martyres* is here used in its early meaning of 'witnesses,' not in its later sense of 'martyrs'; those who testified to Christ, although not necessarily sealing their testimony with death.

11 Cf. above, 3.20, where Eusebius has already given this part of the quotation in his own words.

12 The brother of Joseph; cf. above, 3.11.

13 For the heretics mentioned by Hegesippus, cf. below, 4.22.

14 1 Tim. 6.20.

Chapter 33

So great a persecution was extended against us at that time in many places that Plinius Secundus,¹ one of the most eminent of governors, being disturbed by the great number of martyrs, reported to the emperor on the multitude of those who were being put to death for their faith; likewise, in the same communication, he indicated that he understood that they did nothing wicked or contrary to the laws except that, rising at dawn, they sang to Christ as though a God, but that they renounced adultery and murder and criminal offenses akin to these and did all things in accord with the laws. In reply, Trajan issued the following decree: that the tribe of Christians be not sought out, but, when met, be punished. Thus, the threat of persecution² which pressed terribly upon us was to some extent extinguished; nevertheless, opportunities remained for those who wished to do us harm, for sometimes the people, sometimes, too, the local authorities prepared plots against us, so that without open persecutions partial ones broke out in the provinces and many of the faithful encountered martyrdom in various ways. Our narrative has been taken from Tertullian's Latin *Apology*, from which we quoted above, and its translation runs as follows:³ 'Yet we have found that search for us has also been prevented.'⁴ For

1 Commonly known as Pliny the Younger to distinguish him from his uncle, Plinius Secundus the Elder; a man of literary accomplishments and a close friend of the Emperor Trajan. The letter referred to here and Trajan's reply are Nos. 96 (97) .7 and 97 (98) .2 of Book 10 of the *Epistles* of Pliny.

2 No systematic persecution of the Christians simultaneously in all parts of the Empire was carried on until the time of Decius.

3 Tertullian, *Apol.* 2; cf. *Fathers of the Church* 10.

4 Tertullian and the early Fathers generally regarded Trajan's answer to Pliny as a triumph for Christians, assuming that as a result of it they were better off than ever before in relation to the law. Actually, this letter for the first time officially declared Christianity to be a *religio illicita*. Henceforth, to be a Christian was a crime before the law. Hitherto, this question had not been decided; each ruler was left to act as he saw fit.

when Plinius Secundus, who governed the province, condemned certain Christians and deprived them of their ranks, being troubled by their great number, as a result of which he knew not what should be done in the future, he communicated with the Emperor Trajan, saying that except for their unwillingness to sacrifice to idols he had discovered nothing wicked among them. And he also mentioned this, that the Christians rose at dawn and sang hymns to Christ as to a God and in order to preserve their teaching⁵ forbade murder, adultery, avarice, robbery, things like these. In reply to this, Trajan wrote that the tribe of Christians be not sought out, but, when met, be punished.' Such things took place at that time.

Chapter 34

In the third year of the reign of the emperor¹ mentioned above, Clement gave over the ministry of the bishops at Rome to Evarestos² and departed this life, after he had been in charge of the teaching of the divine Word for nine years altogether.

Chapter 35

Moreover, when Symeon also died in the manner described above,¹ a certain Jew named Justus,² himself one of the many

5 The Greek word used by Eusebius is *epistēmēn*, which means 'knowledge' and makes no sense here, in an unsuccessful attempt to translate Tertullian's *disciplinam*.

1 Trajan.

2 Eusebius (4.1) says that Evarestos was bishop for eight years; in his *Chron.* he states seven. The exact duration of his episcopate is unknown.

1 Cf. above, 3.32.

2 Cf. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 66, 20, where he is called Judas. All that we know is contained here.

thousands of the circumcision who at that time believed in Christ, succeeded to the episcopal throne in Jerusalem.

Chapter 36

At this time, Polycarp,¹ a companion of the Apostles, was pre-eminent in Asia, having been entrusted with the bishopric of the Church at Smyrna by eye-witnesses and servants of the Lord. At this time, Papias² became well known, himself being Bishop of the diocese of Herapolis, and Ignatius to this day heralded by many,³ who obtained the bishopric of the church

¹ On Polycarp, cf. below, 4.14.

² According to Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 5.33.3,4), Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, was companion of Polycarp and a hearer of the Apostle John. The latter part of this statement is seriously doubted. In all probability, he was born about 70, and died before the middle of the second century. According to Eusebius (3.39), he was a decided Chiliasm and a person of limited understanding. That he was an Ebionite, as has been asserted, cannot be substantiated. Little more is known about Papias.

³ Eusebius, following the oldest tradition, makes Evodius the first Bishop of Antioch and Ignatius the second. Three different recensions of epistles assigned to Ignatius are: (1) a longer Greek recension, consisting of fifteen epistles, first published in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; (2) a shorter Greek recension, containing seven of the fifteen epistles of the longer recension but in a much shorter version, with the same titles as those given by Eusebius here, first discovered and published in the seventeenth century; and (3) a Syriac version, containing three of these latter seven, namely to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans, but in a still briefer version, discovered in the nineteenth century. Scholars today are in general agreed on the authenticity of the shorter Greek recension. The only mention of Ignatius before Eusebius occurs in Polycarp, *Ep. ad. Phil.* 9.13; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5.28.3; and Origen, *Prol. in Cant.* and *Hom. 6 in Luc.* Even granting the genuineness of the letters, we have little information on the life of Ignatius. We know with certainty only that he was Bishop of the Church at Antioch in Syria; that he had been condemned to martyrdom; and that when he wrote the epistles he was on his way to Rome to suffer martyrdom. In his epistles, however, about the character and opinions of the man, Ignatius made a very deep impression upon his age. Of him it has been said: 'He is the incarnation, as it were, of the three closely connected ideas: the

at Antioch second in succession to Peter. Report has it that he was sent from Syria to the city of Rome and became food for wild beasts because of his testimony to Christ.⁴ While he was making the journey through Asia under the strictest military guard, he strengthened the diocese in each city where he stayed by spoken sermons and exhortations, and he especially exhorted them above all to be on their guard against the heresies which then for the first time were prevalent and he urged them to hold fast to the tradition of the Apostles to which he thought it necessary, for security's sake, to give form by written testimony. So, when he came

glory of martyrdom, the omnipotence of the episcopacy, and the hatred of heresy and schism. Hierarchical pride and humility, Christian charity, and churchly exclusiveness are typically represented in Ignatius.'

Ignatius constitutes a most important link between the Apostles and the Fathers of the early Church. The importance of his letters for the dogmatic character of apostolic Christianity can scarcely be exaggerated. Cardinal Newman rightly says ('The Theology of the Seven Epistles of St. Ignatius' in *Historical Sketches* 1, London 1890) that 'the whole system of Catholic doctrine may be discovered, at least in outline, not to say in parts filled up, in the course of his seven epistles.' The *Catholic Encyclopedia* lists the following among the Catholic doctrines to be found in the epistles: the Church was divinely established as a visible society, the salvation of souls is its end, and those who separate themselves from it cut themselves off from God; the hierarchy of the Church was instituted by Christ; the threefold character of the hierarchy; the order of the episcopacy superior by divine authority to that of the priesthood; the unity, holiness, catholicity, and infallibility of the Church; the doctrine of the Eucharist, which word we find for the first time applied to the Blessed Sacrament, just as in *Smyrn.* 8, we meet for the first time the phrase 'Catholic Church,' used to designate all Christians; the Incarnation; the supernatural virtue of virginity, already much esteemed and made the subject of a vow; the religious character of matrimony; the value of united prayer; the primacy of the See of Rome. Furthermore, he denounces in principle the doctrine of private judgment in matters of religion. The heresy against which he inveighs most is Docetism. He also vigorously condemns all Judaizing heresies.

⁴ Except for a late statement by John Malalas, which names Antioch, the letters and tradition definitely indicate Rome as the place of his martyrdom.

to Smyrna⁵ where Polycarp was, he wrote one letter to the church at Ephesus, mentioning its pastor Onesimus,⁶ and another to the church at Magnesia on the Meander, where in turn he made mention of Bishop Damas, and another to the church at Tralles, of which he relates that Polybius was then ruler. Besides these, he also wrote to the Church at Rome, to which he extended a request that they should not deprive him of the hope for which he longed by begging him off from martyrdom. It is worth while making a very brief extract from this in support of what has been said. Now he writes as follows:⁷ 'From Syria to Rome I fight with wild beasts by land and sea, by night and by day, bound to ten leopards, that is, a company of soldiers, who become worse even as they are being treated kindly. In the midst of their evil deeds, however, I become the more a disciple, "yet I am not hereby justified."⁸ May I enjoy the beasts that are ready for me, which I pray be found prompt for me, which I shall even coax to devour me promptly, and not treat me as they have some, refusing to touch them out of fear; even if of themselves they are unwilling and do not wish to do so, I shall force them to it. Forgive me; I know what is expedient for me; now I am beginning to be a disciple. May I envy nothing of things seen or unseen, that I may attain to

5 Cf. Ignatius *Eph.* 21; 1.2.6; *Magn.* 2.15; *Trall.* 1.12; *Rom.* 5. Of the seven letters of Ignatius recognized as genuine, the first four—to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, and Romans—were written from Smyrna, while he was on his way to Rome. The cities of Ephesus, Magnesia, and Trallia were south of Smyrna, but Ignatius was taken by a road farther north, which passed through Philadelphia and Sardis. Accordingly, he did not visit these three cities to which he sent letters from Smyrna. For an English version of the letters of St. Ignatius, cf. *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. 1 of this series.

6 We know nothing more of this Onesimus, or of Damas and Polybius mentioned below.

7 Ignatius, *Rom.* 5.

8 1 Cor. 4.4.

Jesus Christ. Let there come upon me fire and cross and struggle with wild beasts, wrenching of bones, mangling of limbs, crushing of the whole body, tortures of the Devil, provided only I may attain to Jesus Christ.'

These matters he wrote from the city mentioned to the churches cited. When he was already beyond Smyrna, he again communicated in writing from Troas⁹ with the people in Philadelphia and with the church of the Smyrnaeans and especially with Polycarp who was at the head of this church. And since he knew him very well as an apostolic man, like a true and good shepherd he places the church at Antioch in his hands, begging him to have zealous care for it.¹⁰ This same man, writing to the Smyrnaeans,¹¹ quotes words from I do not know where, relating the following about Christ: 'But I know and believe that He was in the flesh even after the Resurrection. And when He came to Peter and His companions, He said to them: "Take, touch me and see that I am not an incorporeal phantom." And straightway they touched Him and believed.'¹²

Irenaeus also knew of his martyrdom, and quoted from his letters in these words:¹³ 'As one of our people said, when he was condemned to beasts for his testimony unto God,¹⁴ "I am God's wheat and I am ground by the teeth of beasts that I may be found pure bread."'

9 Cf. *Philad.* 11; *Smyrn.* 12; *Polycarp* 8; *Polycarp* 7. From the evidences of the epistles themselves, it seems clear that Troas was the city from which Ignatius wrote to the Philadelphians, to the Smyrnaeans, and to Polycarp. He had visited both churches on his way to Troas, and had seen Polycarp in Smyrna.

10 Cf. *Polycarp* 3.

11 Cf. *Smyrn.* 3.

12 Cf. Luke 24.39.

13 Iren., *Adv. haer.* 5.28.4.

14 Cf. Ignatius, *Rom.* 4.

Polycarp, too, mentions these very things in the letter to the Philippians that bears his name,¹⁵ using these very words: 'I urge you all, therefore, to obey authority and to practise all patience such as you saw with your own eyes not only in the blessed Ignatius and Rufus and Zosimus,¹⁶ but also in others among you, and in Paul himself, and in the other Apostles, being persuaded that all these "have not run in vain,"¹⁷ but in faith and righteousness, and that they are with the Lord, with whom they also suffered, in the place that is their due.¹⁸ For they did not love this world,¹⁹ but Him who died for our sakes and was raised by God on account of us.' And later he adds: 'Both you and Ignatius wrote to me that, if anyone was going to Syria, he should also take letters from you. And this very thing I shall do, if I have a suitable opportunity, either I or he whom I am sending to represent you and me. As you requested, we have sent you the letters of Ignatius which were sent to us by him and such other letters as we have in our possession. These have been appended to this letter and from them you will be able to derive great profit. For they contain faith and patience and all edification that pertains to our Lord.'²⁰ Such is the story about Ignatius, and Heros²¹ succeeded him in the bishopric of Antioch.

15 Polycarp, *Philipp.* 9.

16 Nothing is known of Rufus and Zosimus.

17 Phil. 12.16.

18 1 Clem. 5.

19 Cf. 2 Tim. 4.10.

20 Polycarp, *Philipp.* 13. This gives strong support to the authenticity of the epistles of St. Ignatius. For this very reason its genuineness has been questioned by some, but without valid grounds.

21 We have no reliable information about Heros. Eusebius in his *Chronicle* says that Heros became Bishop of Antioch in the tenth year of Trajan (107) and was succeeded by Cornelius in the twelfth year of Hadrian (128).

Chapter 37

Among those who were celebrated in these times was also Quadratus,¹ who, report holds, was distinguished along with the daughters of Philip by a gift of prophecy, and many more others besides were known at this time, who take first rank in the apostolic succession. And these, being pious disciples of such great men, built in every place upon the foundations of the churches already established everywhere by the Apostles,² spreading the Gospel more and more, and scattering the saving seeds of the kingdom of heaven far and wide throughout the whole world. Indeed, most of the disciples of that time, struck in soul by the divine Logos with an ardent love of philosophy,³ first fulfilled the Saviour's command⁴ and distributed their goods among the needy,⁵ and then, entering upon long journeys, performed the work of evangelists,⁶ being eager to preach everywhere to those who had not yet the word of faith and to pass on the writing of the divine Gospels.⁷ As soon as they had only laid the foundations of the faith in some foreign lands, they appointed others as pastors and entrusted to them the nurture of those who had recently been brought in, but they themselves went on to other lands and peoples with the grace and co-operation of God, for a great many marvelous miracles of the divine spirit were still being worked by them at that time, so that whole

1 All that is known of this Quadratus is contained here and below, 5.16. The identification of this Quadratus with Quadratus the apologist (cf. 4.3) is by no means certain.

2 Cf. 1 Cor. 3.10.

3 I.e., the ascetic way of living; cf. below, 6.3.

4 Cf. Matt. 10.9; Mark 6.8; Luke 9.3.

5 Cf. Matt. 19.21.

6 Cf. Rom. 15.20,21.

7 Cf. Eph. 9.19,20.

multitudes of men at the first hearing eagerly received within their souls the religion of the Creator of the universe.

Since it is impossible for us to enumerate all by name who at some time in the early succession of the Apostles became pastors or evangelists in the churches throughout the world, we have naturally made mention by name of those only through whose writings the tradition of the teachings of the Apostles has been brought down to us in our time.

Chapter 38

Such writings were the epistles of Ignatius, of which we have given a list,¹ and that of Clement which is accepted by all, which he wrote in the name of the Church at Rome to the Church of the Corinthians.² In this he has presented many ideas from the Epistle to the Hebrews,³ and he has even made use of some verbal quotations from it, thus making it very clear that it was not a recent work, and for this reason, also, it has seemed natural to include it among the other writings of the Apostle. For, since Paul had communicated in writing with the Hebrews in their native tongue, some say that the Evangelist Luke, others that this Clement himself, translated the writing. The latter would be more probable because the epistle of Clement and that to the Hebrews preserve a similarity of style and, furthermore, because the ideas in the two writings are not very different.⁴

But we must realize that there is said to be a second

¹ Cf. above, 3.36.

² Cf. 3.16.

³ Cf. 3.3.

⁴ 1 Clem. 17=Heb. 11.37; 1 Clem. 21=Heb. 4.12; 1 Clem. 27=Heb. 10.23; 1 Clem. 36=Heb. 2.17,18; 4.14,15; 8.3; 1.3; 4.7; 5.13.

epistle of Clement;⁵ however, we are not certain that this was known as well as the former, since we learn that the ancients never made any use of it. Now, some have brought forward quite recently other wordy and lengthy compositions also as supposedly his, including dialogues with Peter and Apion,⁶ but no mention of these at all is made by the ancients, for they do not preserve the pure mark of apostolic orthodoxy.

Chapter 39

Now, the acknowledged writing of Clement is well known and the works of Ignatius and Polycarp¹ have been mentioned; and of Papias five treatises are in circulation which bear the title, 'Interpretation of the Oracles of the Lord.'² And Irenaeus makes mention of these as the only ones written by him, speaking as follows: 'These things, too, Papias, an

5 Eusebius is the first to mention a second letter of Clement. Such a letter, however, was in general circulation as genuine after the fifth century. It is now clear that this epistle is not an epistle but a homily; it was not written in the first century by Clement, but in the middle of the second century by some unknown author. It is of great interest, however, as the oldest homily extant. It still appears in all editions of the Apostolic Fathers as the "Second Epistle of Clement"; cf. Vol. I of this series.

6 A number of Pseudo-Clementine writings from the third and following centuries are still extant. Chief among there is what professes to be a record by Clement of the discourses of the Apostle Peter and an account of Clement's family history and of his travels with Peter.

1 Cf. above, 3.36.

2 No longer extant except in a number of fragments which have been preserved by Irenaeus, Eusebius, and others. These fragments are usually published in editions of the Apostolic Fathers. For an English version, cf. Vol. I of this series. A common belief is that it was a record of oral traditions about the Lord which Papias had gathered with a commentary of these traditions; others contend that it was a complete Gospel; still others that it was a commentary on an existing Gospel or Gospels. Eusebius seems to be in accord with the last.

ancient man, who was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, attests in writing in the fourth of his books, for five books were composed by him.³ Such are the words of Irenaeus. Papias himself, however, according to the preface of his treatises, makes it clear that he was never a hearer or eye-witness of the holy Apostles, but he shows that he received the doctrines of the faith from those who knew them, and he does so in these words: 'I shall not hesitate to set down for you together with my interpretations all that I have ever learned well from the presbyters and recall well, being confident of their truth. For, unlike most, I did not take pleasure in those who say much, but in those who teach the truth, and not in those who relate the commandments of others, but in those who relate the commandments given to the faith⁴ by the Lord and derived from the truth itself; but if ever anyone came who had carefully followed the presbyters,⁵ I inquired as to the words of the presbyters, what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip or what Thomas or James or what John or Matthew or any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion⁶ and the presbyter John, the Lord's disciples, were saying. For I did not suppose that information from books helped me so much as that from a living and abiding voice.'

His mentioning the name of John twice is worth noting here. The first of these he reckons along with Peter and James and Matthew and the other Apostles, meaning clearly the Evangelist, but the other John, after expanding his statement, he places outside the number of the Apostles, placing Aristion before him, and he distinctly calls him a presbyter.

³ Iren. 5.33.4.

⁴ I.e., to those that believe and have faith.

⁵ Cf. Luke 1.3. The meaning of the Greek is uncertain.

⁶ Of this Aristion nothing further is known.

Thus, by these words is proved the truth of the story of those who have said that two persons in Asia bore the same name, and that there were two tombs in Ephesus and each of these even today is said to be John's.⁷ We must give attention to this, for it is probable that the second (unless you would prefer the first) saw the Revelation which passes under the name of John.⁸ And Papias, who is now being explained by us, confesses that he had received the words of the Apostles from their followers, but says that he himself was a hearer of Aristion and the presbyter John. At any rate, he mentions them many times and presents their traditions in his writings. Let us at least say this much to good purpose. But it is worth while to add to the words of Papias already quoted other expressions of his by which he describes certain marvels and other matters which probably reached him through tradition. Now, it has already been pointed out above⁹ that Philip the Apostle lived at Hierapolis with his daughters, but it must now be noted that Papias, who was a contemporary of theirs, reveals that he received a marvelous story from the daughters of Philip, for he relates that a resurrection of a corpse took place in his time,¹⁰ and again that another miracle took place in connection with Justus surnamed Barsabas, who drank a deadly poison and through the grace of the Lord suffered no harm. The book of Acts¹¹ relates in these words

7 Cf. below, 7.25, where Eusebius quotes Dionysius of Alexandria to attest to the existence of two tombs in Ephesus with the name of John. Cf. also, Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 9), who says that some regard the two as memorials of the one John, the Apostle.

8 Eusebius' suggestion here that the Apocalypse was written by a presbyter John, some one other than the Apostle John, was made by Dionysius (cf. below, 7.25). Although this suggestion is revived periodically, the evidence to support it has never been able to dislodge the traditional belief in the authorship of John the Apostle.

9 Cf. above, 3.31.

10 I.e., in the time of Philip.

11 Acts 1.23,24.

that the holy Apostles, after the ascension of the Saviour, appointed this Justus together with Matthias and prayed over them for the choice of one in the place of Judas to fill up their number. 'And they appointed two, Joseph, called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias; and praying, they said.' And the same author presents other accounts as having come to him from unwritten tradition, and some strange parables of the Saviour and teachings of His and other more mythical accounts. Among these he says that there will be a period of about a thousand years after the resurrection of the dead, when the kingdom of Christ will be established on this earth in material form.¹² I suppose that he got these ideas through a perverse reading of the accounts of the Apostles, not realizing that these were expressed by them mystically in figures. For he appears to be a man of very little intelligence,¹³ to speak judging from his books, but he was responsible for the great number of Church writers after him holding the same opinion as himself, who proposed in their

12 Chiliasm or Millenarianism: the belief on the part of Christians that at end of time Christ will return in all His splendor to gather together the just, to annihilate hostile powers, and to establish a glorious kingdom *on earth* for the enjoyment of the highest spiritual and material blessings. He Himself will rule as its king, and all the just, including the saints recalled to life, will take part in it. At the end of this kingdom the saints will enter heaven with Christ, while the wicked, who have also been raised from the dead, will be condemned to eternal damnation. This glorious rule of Christ and His saints on earth was generally believed to last a thousand years. The chief Biblical support for this doctrine is found in Apoc. 20.1-6. The leading supporters of this doctrine in the ante-Nicene period were the author of the epistle of Barnabas, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Tertullian. The chief opponents of Chiliasm in this same period were Gaius, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Eusebius. After Constantine, this belief was regarded more and more as a heresy. St. Augustine formulated the doctrine in general believed from his time on, that the millenium is the present reign of Christ, which began with His resurrection. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.*, s.v. Millenarianism. resurrection. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.* s.v. Millenarianism.

13 The extant fragments of Papias bear out this statement.

support the antiquity of the man, as, for instance, Irenaeus and whoever else appeared to hold similar views.

In his own writing he also passes on interpretations of the Lord's words from Aristion, who has been mentioned before, and traditions from John the presbyter. After referring the studious to these, we shall now of necessity add to his words already quoted a tradition about Mark who wrote the Gospel, which he gives in these words: 'This also the Presbyter¹⁴ used to say, "When Mark became Peter's interpreter, he wrote down accurately, although not in order, all that he remembered of what was said or done by the Lord. For he had not heard the Lord nor followed Him, but later, as I have said, he did Peter, who made his teaching fit his needs without, as it were, making any arrangement of the Lord's oracles,¹⁵ so that Mark made no mistake in thus writing some things down as he remembered them. For to one thing he gave careful attention, to omit nothing of what he heard and to falsify nothing in this." ' Now, this has been related by Papias regarding Mark, and regarding Matthew he has spoken as follows: 'Now Matthew collected the oracles in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he was able.'¹⁶

The same writer has used testimonies from the first Epistle of John¹⁷ and likewise from that of Peter,¹⁸ and he has set forth another story about a woman who was accused before the Lord of many sins, which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Let us observe this much, out of a feeling of necessity, in addition to what has already been quoted.

14 Cf. above, 2.15.

15 Reading *logion* rather than *logon*, 'discourses.'

16 Cf. above, 3.24.

17 Cf. 3.24.

18 Cf. 3.3.

BOOK FOUR

Chapter 1



ABOUT THE TWELFTH YEAR of the reign of Trajan¹ the bishop² of the diocese of Alexandria, whom we mentioned a little above, departed this life, and Primus,³ the fourth from the Apostles, received the administration of affairs there. At this time, too, at Rome, after Evarestus⁴ had fulfilled his eighth year, Alexander,⁵ who was the fifth in succession from Peter and Paul, took up the bishopric.

1 In 109.

2 Cerdo; cf. above, 3.21.

3 Nothing reliable is known about Primus himself, although he has a part in later tradition. Until the latter part of the second century our knowledge of the Alexandrian Church is very vague and uncertain.

4 Cf. above, 3.34.

5 We know nothing of the life and character of Alexander. Lists of bishops dating from the end of the second century are extant. The oldest list of Roman bishops is given by Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3.3.3). The list given here by Eusebius is the same as that of Irenaeus, but with the addition of dates. In his *Chronicle*, Eusebius gives different dates. We may assume that when he wrote the *Chronicle* he had discovered another source which he regarded as more reliable. We should also remember that the transmission of dates in manuscript traditions is very precarious.

Chapter 2

While the affairs of our Saviour's teaching and of the Church were flourishing daily and were proceeding to even greater progress, the misfortune of the Jews in a succession of evils was attaining a climax. When the emperor was now advancing into the eighteenth year¹ of his reign, a rebellion of the Jews again broke out and destroyed a great multitude of them.² For in Alexandria and in the rest of Egypt and also in Cyrene,³ as if incited by some terrible spirit of rebellion, they rushed into revolt against their Greek fellow citizens, and, having increased the scope of the rebellion, in the following year they entered upon a war of no small magnitude while Lupus⁴ was governor of all Egypt. In the first encounter it happened that they overpowered the Greeks, who fled to Alexandria and captured and killed the Jews in the city, but, although the Jews of Cyrene lost the alliance of these Jews, they continued to plunder the country of Egypt and to devastate the districts⁵ in it under the leadership of Lucuas.⁶ Against these the emperor sent Marcius Turbo⁷ with a land and sea force, in addition to cavalry. He carried on war against them vigorously in many battles and for a considerable time, and killed many thousands of Jews, not only those of Cyrene but also those of Egypt who had come to the aid of

1 In 111.

2 Cf. Cassius Dio 68.32; 69.12f. The Jews and Greeks lived together in many cities, and because of their intense hatred of each other were constantly getting into difficulties.

3 According to Acts 6.9, the Jews of Cyrene, just west of Egypt, had a synagogue in Jerusalem. They were very numerous in both Egypt and Cyrene.

4 Otherwise unknown.

5 The Greek word is *nomoi*; cf. above, 2.17.

6 Cassius Dio (68.32) calls him Andreas. It has been suggested that he probably bore both a Jewish and a Roman name, as did many Jews of that period.

7 One of the most distinguished generals under Emperors Trajan and Hadrian; a praetorian prefect under Hadrian. Cf. Cassius Dio 69.18, and Spartian. *Had.* 4.9,15.

Lucuas, their king. And the emperor, suspecting that the Jews in Mesopotamia also would attack the inhabitants, ordered Lusius Quietus⁸ to clear the province of them. He drew up his force and killed a great multitude of the Jews there, and for this success he was appointed Governor of Judaea by the emperor. These events have been chronicled in these very words by the Greek historians⁹ who have described the events of the same period.

Chapter 3

After Trajan had ruled for nineteen and a half years,¹ Aelius Hadrian succeeded to the sovereignty. To him Quadratus² addressed and delivered a treatise which he had composed as a defense for religion because certain wicked men³ were trying to trouble our people. To this day it is in circulation among a great many of the brethren; we even have a

8 An independent Moorish chief. He served voluntarily in the Roman army and was a great favorite with Trajan, who made him Governor of Judaea and later raised him to the consulship. Themistius (*Orat.* 16) says that Trajan planned to make him his successor. Cf. Cassius Dio (68.8, 22.30, 32; 69.2) and Spartian (*Had.* 5.7).

9 The only extant Greek accounts of these affairs are those of Cassius Dio and Orosius. Apparently there were others in the time of Eusebius.

1 From January 27, 98, to August 7 or 8, 117.

2 Quadratus and Aristides, mentioned below, are the most ancient apologists known. No mention is made of them before Eusebius, and the few lines quoted here are all that we have of the *Apology* of Quadratus. That the writings of these two men were responsible for favorable treatment of the Christians by the emperors is erroneous. This Quadratus is not to be confused with Quadratus (cf. below, 4.23), Bishop of Athens in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. There are insurmountable chronological difficulties here. Furthermore, there is no good reason for identifying this Quadratus with the prophet mentioned in 3.37 and 5.7. These two seem to have belonged to different countries.

3 Eusebius seems to believe that the persecutions did not come directly from the emperors, but through the plottings of the enemies of Christianity.

copy ourselves. From this one can see clear evidence of his intellect and apostolic orthodoxy. The same author reveals his early date when he relates the following in his own words: 'But the works of our Saviour were always at hand, for they were true, those who were cured, those who rose from the dead, who were seen not only when being cured and when rising, but also, being always at hand, not only when the Saviour was on earth, but even after he had departed, survived for a considerable time, so that some of them have even come down to our own time.' Such was this Quadratus. Aristides,⁴ also, a man of faith and inspired of our religion, has very much like Quadratus left behind a defense of faith addressed to Hadrian. This man's writing also has been preserved to this day among a great many.

Chapter 4

In the third year of the same reign,¹ Alexander,² Bishop of Rome, died after completing the tenth year of his admin-

⁴ Aristides of Athens, a contemporary of Quadratus, called by Eusebius in his *Chronicle* 'a philosopher.' He is not mentioned again and his *Apology* is apparently not quoted by any of the Fathers. The Aristides mentioned above, 1.7, and below, 6.31, lived about a hundred years later. St. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 20) calls our Quadratus, '*philosophus eloquentissimus*,' and in a letter (70) to Magnus says that the *Apology* was '*contextum philosophorum sententiis*,' and was imitated later by Justin Martyr. It was, according to Eusebius, in wide circulation among the Christians of the fourth century. There are traces of it in the ninth century, and then it disappears for about a thousand years, when (1878) the Mechitarite monks of San Lazzaro, at Venice, published a Latin translation of an Armenian fragment together with an Armenian homily under the title, *Two Sermons of St. Aristides, a Philosopher of Athens*. In 1889, Harris of Cambridge discovered a Syriac version of the entire *Apology* in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, and translated it into English. Cf. *Texts and Studies* 1.1 (Cambridge 1891).

¹ Of Hadrian, 120.

² Cf. 4.1.

istration; Xystus³ was his successor. And at the same time Justus⁴ succeeded Primus,⁵ who departed from the diocese of the Alexandrians in the twelfth year of his episcopacy.

Chapter 5

Although I have found the chronology of the bishops in Jerusalem now here preserved in writing,¹ for tradition holds that they were very short-lived, I have learned this much from documents,² that until the siege of the Jews by Hadrian³ the successions of bishops here were fifteen in number, all of whom, it is said, were Hebrews in origin and had received the knowledge of Christ truly, so that they were judged worthy of the episcopal administration by those who had the power to judge such matters; for at that time their entire Church consisted of Hebrews who had persevered as faithful from the Apostles down to the siege of that time, when the Jews again revolted from the Romans and were conquered in great

3 Xystus I. His dates can be established only with difficulty and with some uncertainty. The date of his becoming Bishop of Rome, as given here by Eusebius, cannot be correct. Trustworthy evidence shows that he must have died as early as 126, possibly in 124. Thus, he must have become bishop no later than 116, before the death of Trajan. The evidence for his martyrdom is late and unreliable.

4 Nothing more than is related here is known about Justus. If the present statement be correct, he became bishop about 120, in the third or fourth year of the reign of Hadrian.

5 Cf. above, 4.1, where Eusebius says that Alexander of Rome and Primus of Alexandria became bishops at the same time. In this chapter he says that Alexander died after reigning as bishop for ten years, and Primus after twelve years. No reliance can be placed on these figures.

1 Eusebius gives these same names of Bishops of Jerusalem in his *Chronicle*, but with dates for only two or three. Dates are given by the late writer Nicephorus Callisti, but they are untrustworthy.

2 It has been conjectured that these documents were in the church of Jerusalem itself.

3 In 135; cf. below, 4.7.

battles. Since the bishops of the circumcision ceased at this time, it might be necessary now to list these from the first. The first, then, was James⁴ who was called the brother of the Lord; and after him was the second, Symeon;⁵ the third, Justus,⁶ the fourth, Zacchaeus;⁷ the fifth, Tobias; the sixth, Benjamin; the seventh, John; the eighth, Matthias; the ninth, Philip; the tenth, Seneca;⁸ the eleventh, Justus; the twelfth, Leir; the thirteenth, Ephres;⁹ the fourteenth, Joseph; and last of all, the fifteenth, Judas. This many were the bishops in the city of Jerusalem from the Apostles to the time indicated, all of them belonging to the circumcision. Now, when the reign of Hadrian was in its twelfth year, Telesphorus,¹⁰ the seventh from the Apostles, succeeded Xystus who had completed the tenth year of his episcopacy at Rome; after a lapse of a year and some months, Eumenes¹¹ succeeded, as the sixth bishop in order, to the government of the diocese of Alexandria, after his predecessor¹² had continued in office for eleven years.

4 Cf. above, 2.1.

5 Cf. above, 3.11.

6 We know nothing about Justus and the other bishops mentioned here. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 66.20) calls Justus, Judas.

7 Epiphanius calls Zacchaeus, Zacharias.

8 This is a Latin name, but it does not disprove a Hebrew origin. It was common for even native Jews to bear two names, a Greek or Roman name or one of Hebrew origin. They sometimes used the former exclusively.

9 Epiphanius calls him Vaphris; the Armenian version of the *Chronicle* calls him Ephrem; Jerome's version, Ephres, and Syncellus, Ephraim, the Hebrew form of the name.

10 Circa 125-136; Eusebius and other sources differ on these dates. Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3.3.3) says that he suffered a glorious martyrdom. Cf. below, 4.10 and 5.6. He was the seventh Roman bishop in succession from the Apostles. According to other evidence, he probably died between 135 and 137, and not in the first year of Antoninus Pius (138) as Eusebius declares in Ch. 10.

11 Nothing is known about Eumenes. Eusebius is consistent (below, Ch. 11, and *Chron.*) in saying that he held office for thirteen years. Jerome differs by two years.

12 Justus; cf. above, 4.4.

Chapter 6

And so, as the rebellion of the Jews¹ again progressed in seriousness and extent, Rufus, Governor of Judaea, when an auxiliary military force had been sent him by the emperor, set out against them, treating their madness without mercy, killing in masses thousands of men, children, and women alike, and by the law enslaving their lands. At that time a certain Bar Chochebas by name, which means 'star,' was the general of the Jews, who among other characteristics was a cut-throat and a bandit, but who relied on his name, as if dealing with slaves, and boasted that he was a star that had come down from heaven to shed light upon them in their misery. When the war had reached its height during the eighteenth year of the reign of Hadrian² in Beththera³ (this was a very rugged citadel, located at not a very long distance from Jerusalem), and when the siege had become long drawn out and the rebels had been driven to the last extremity of destruction by famine and thirst and he who was responsible for their madness had paid his deserved penalty, Hadrian by a legal decree and ordinances absolutely prevented the entire nation from henceforth entering the region around Jerusalem, giving orders that it should never see its ancestral home even from a

1 Because of constant rebellions in Cyrene and elsewhere, the position of the Jews grew constantly worse. Bitter persecution plagued them in Palestine during the reign of Trajan, and Hadrian regarded them as an extremely troublesome people. At this time, while the Jews were anxiously awaiting the Messiah, a man, probably Simon, appeared, claiming to be the Messiah and promising to free the Jews from Roman oppression. This man took the name Bar Chochebas, literally, 'son of a star' (cf. Num. 24.17). After his defeat by the Romans, the Jews called him Bar Choziba, 'son of a lie.' Under Bar Chochebas, the Christians, since they refused to join him, were very cruelly treated. Cf. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1.31). On this last war of the Jews, see Cassius Dio 69.12-14.

2 August 134 to August 135.

3 Somewhere in Judaea; otherwise, nothing is known about it.

distance. Ariston of Pella⁴ gives the story. Thus, when the city had come to be free of the nation of the Jews, and its ancient inhabitants had been entirely destroyed, it was colonized by a foreign race and the Roman city that thereafter arose changed its name and was called Aelia in honor of the reigning emperor, Aelius Hadrian. And as the church in it was now composed of Gentiles, the first after the bishops of the circumcision to be entrusted with the administration of those there was Marcus.⁵

Chapter 7

When the churches throughout the world were shining like the most brilliant luminaries, and faith in our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ waxed strong midst every race of man,¹ the Devil, that hater of the good, like an enemy of the truth and one who has ever been most hostile to man's salvation, turned all his machinations against the Church. Of old, he armed himself against her by persecutions from without; but then, shut off from this, employing wicked men and sorcerers as instruments for the ruin of souls and servants of destruction, he conducted his campaign by other methods, devising every means that sorcerers and deceivers, by assuming the same name as our religion, might both lead those of the faithful

⁴ The work is not extant, and very little is known about Ariston himself. The only reliable information that we have comes from Eusebius and Maximus Confessor (*De mystica theol.* 1). He was the author of a Dialogue of *Papiscus and Jason*, a work quoted frequently by the Fathers but never assigned to Ariston. This was a dialogue between a Hebrew Christian and an Alexandrian Jew. It is not certain, but very probable, that Eusebius is quoting from that work here. He obviously did not like the work, as is natural from its character, and is silent about it. The town of Pella was in Peraea, east of the Jordan; cf. above, 3. 5.

⁵ Nothing more is known of him. On the Gentile Bishops of Jerusalem, cf. below, 5.12.

¹ An exaggeration, of course.

they trapped into the depth of destruction and, by the deeds which they practiced, turn aside those ignorant of the faith from the path to the saving Word. Now, from Menander, whom we have already mentioned above as the successor of Simon,² a kind of serpentine power with two mouths and two heads came forth and established the leaders of two different heresies, Saturninus,³ an Antiochian by race, and Basilides⁴ of Alexandria. Of these, the one established schools of God-hating heresy in Syria; the other, in Egypt. Irenaeus⁵ points out that Saturninus for the most part taught false doctrine like that of Menander, but that Basilides, under the pretext of secret mysteries, extended his inventions beyond limit, fashioning monstrous fables for his impious heresy. Now, while a great many of the men of the Church at this time were struggling for the truth and were fighting eloquently for the glory of the Apostles and of the Church, some, too, through their writings were providing for posterity the means of defense against these very heresies that have been mentioned. Of these a most able refutation of Basilides has come down to us from a very famous author of the time, Agrippa Castor,⁶ who reveals the cleverness of the man's deception.

² Cf. above, §26.

³ Called Saturnilius by Hippolytus, Epiphanius, and Theodoret. His followers are termed Saturnilians by Hegesippus, as quoted below, 4.22. Little more than is indicated here is known about him.

⁴ The earliest of the Alexandrian Gnostics. He was a native of Alexandria and flourished under Emperors Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, about 120-140. Basilides' own work, *Exegetica*, is lost, but all the treatises of the Fathers against heresies mention him. Apparently, his system made a great impression in the beginning, but it soon died out or was hopelessly corrupted. He had no followers of any account except his own son Isidore. The only refutation of his system seems to have been written by Agrippa Castor, mentioned here by Eusebius. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.*, s.v.

⁵ Cf. Iren. 1.24.1.3.

⁶ The work is not extant. Nothing more is known of Agrippa Castor than what is mentioned here. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 21) and Theodoret (*Fab.* 1.4) add essentially nothing.

While exposing his mysteries, he says that he composed twenty-four books on the Gospel,⁷ and named his own prophets Bar Cabbas and Bar Coph,⁸ and that, after setting some others up for himself that never existed, he applied barbarous names to them to astonish those who marvel at such things; that he taught that the eating of meat offered to idols and the unguarded renunciation of the faith in times of persecution were matters of indifference;⁹ and that, like Pythagoras, he enjoined upon his followers a silence of five years.¹⁰ The above-mentioned author spoke of other things similar to these about Basilides and very nobly brought out into the open the error of the aforementioned heresy. Irenaeus¹¹ also writes that Carpocrates was a contemporary of these men, the father of another heresy called that of the Gnostics.¹² These did not desire any longer, like Basilides, to

7 All that is known about the writings of Basilides is the following: Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 4.12) quotes Book 23 of the *Exegetica* of Basilides; Origen (*Hom. in Luc.* 1) accuses Basilides of having the effrontery to write a *Gospel according to Basilides*, for which there is no other testimony; Ambrose repeats this remark in *Exp. in Luc.* 1.1; and Jerome seems on the same authority to number the *Gospel of Basilides* among the Apocryphal Gospels in his *Comment. in Matt.*

8 These persons are unknown. Cf. Hort (article *Barcabbas* in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*) for a possible connection between the prophecies current among Gnostic groups and Zoroastrian writings.

9 This probably represents a decline in the teachings of Basilides as proclaimed by his later followers, and not the actual teaching of Basilides himself.

10 Agrippa Castor, as quoted here by Eusebius, is the only authority for this law of silence by Basilides. Here again we probably are dealing with a teaching of a later follower rather than of Basilides himself.

11 Cf. *Iren.* 1.25; 1.6.3.4.

12 Just as it is impossible to give a satisfactory definition of Gnosticism, so it is impossible to set a date for its rise. The definition based on the etymology of the word is 'the doctrine of salvation by knowledge.' A more complete and an historical definition of Gnosticism is as follows: 'A collective name for a large number of greatly varying pantheistic-idealistic sects, which flourished from some time before the Christian Era down to the fifth century, and which, while

transmit the magic arts of Simon secretly but openly,¹³ boasting, as of something great, of love potions they carefully prepared and of certain spirits that brought them dreams and protection, and of certain other similar performances. In accordance with this they taught that those who intended to enter upon initiation in their mysteries or, rather, abominations must perform all the most shameful deeds, since in no other way might they escape the cosmic powers, as they might say, except by having fulfilled their obligations to them all through their mysteries. So it happened that the demon who rejoices in evil, by making use of these servants, piteously enslaved to perdition those who were thus deceived by them, and he supplied the unbelieving Gentiles with a great abundance of blasphemy against the Word of God, since the report which started with them poured forth to the calumny of the entire race of Christians. Thus, especially, did it then happen that a blasphemous and most absurd suspicion about us was circulated, namely, that we practiced unlawful commerce with mothers and sisters and enjoyed impious

borrowing the phraseology and some of the tenets of the chief religions of the day, and especially of Christianity, held matter to be a deterioration of spirit, and the whole universe a depravation of the Deity, and taught the ultimate end of being to be the overcoming of the grossness of matter and the return to the Parent-Spirit, which return they held to be inaugurated and facilitated by the appearance of some God-sent Saviour.' Cf. *Cath. Encycl.*, s.v.

The Carpocratians are the first specifically named by Irenaeus (1.25.6) as calling themselves Gnostics. They are mentioned again by Eusebius (4.22) in a quotation from Hegesippus. They are more specifically Greek in their nature than any other Gnostic sect, and their immorality was proverbial (cf. Tertullian, *De anima* 23.35). Other sources on the Carpocratians are: Irenaeus (1.25; 2.31-33), Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 3.2), Hippolytus (*Phil.* 7.20), Tertullian (*De anima* 23.35), Pseudo-Tertullian (*Adv. omnes haer.* 3), Epiphanius (*Haer.* 27), and Philaster (35). Of these, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus are alone independent.

¹³ Eusebius's source for this information is unknown.

feasts.¹⁴ However, he did not have success in this for long, for the truth established itself and as time went on shone with great brilliancy. For the machinations of its enemies were refuted and speedily extinguished by its power, as heresies were invented one upon another, the earlier ones flowing into strange and multifarious forms and perishing now in one way and now in another. But the brilliance of the Catholic and only true Church advanced in growth and greatness, for she ever holds to the same truths and in the same way, radiating the piety and the simplicity and the freedom and the sobriety of her inspired life and philosophy to every race of Greeks and of barbarians. So, with the lapse of time, the calumny against all her teaching was extinguished,¹⁵ and there remained only our doctrine, which was strong among all and was confessed to excel especially in piety and sobriety and in divine and philosophical doctrines, so that no one today dares bring any disgraceful calumny against our faith or any such slander as it was the pleasure of those who were arrayed against us long ago to employ.

Nevertheless, in the times just mentioned, truth again brought forth for itself more champions who campaigned against the godless heresies not alone with unwritten proofs but also with written demonstrations.

¹⁴ A reference to the charges usually made against the early Christians by their enemies: atheism, cannibalism, and incest. Cf. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1.26), Pliny's epistle to Trajan, Tertullian (*Apol.* 7.8 and *Ad nationes* 7). Eusebius essentially follows Irenaeus (1.25.3) in this passage.

¹⁵ Eusebius is correct here. It is noteworthy that Celsus, in his elaborate work against the Christians, makes none of these charges.

Chapter 8

Among these, Hegesippus¹ was well known, whose words we have already employed in abundance,² for we set forth some of the events of the time of the Apostles according to his tradition. This author recorded in five books the unerring tradition of the apostolic preaching in the simplest style, and he indicates the time in which he flourished by writing thus about those who from of old set up idols: 'To whom they erected cenotaphs³ and temples as to the present day, and among them is also Antinous,⁴ a slave of the Emperor Hadrian, in whose honor the Antinoian games are held, which came into being in our day. For he even built a city⁵ named after Antinous, and appointed prophets.' And at this time, too, Justin, a genuine lover of the true philosophy, still continued to busy himself with Greek literature. And he himself also indicates this time in his *Apology to Antoninus* by writing thus: 'We do not think it out of place to mention at this point Antinous, also, who lived in our day and whom all through fear were driven to worship as a god, although they knew who he was and whence he came.'⁶

1 Eusebius places his literary activity too early. Jerome follows Eusebius, discussing Hegesippus between Agrippa Castor and Justin Martyr. Cf. below, 4.22-23.

2 Cf. above, 2.23 and 3.32.

3 A monument in the form of a tomb, but with no body in it.

4 A native of Bithynia, a beautiful page of Hadrian and the object of his excessive affections. According to story, he was drowned in the Nile in 130. Thereupon he was placed among the gods, and temples were built for his worship, especially in Egypt. Games were instituted in his honor at Athens, and were celebrated every fifth year in Mantinea, in Arcadia.

5 The city of Besa in the Thebais, near which Antinous was drowned, was rebuilt by Hadrian and called Antinoöpolis.

6 Justin, *Apol.* 1.29.

The same author, mentioning the war of that time against the Jews, adds the following:⁷ 'For in the Jewish war which has just taken place, Bar Chocheba, the leader of the Jewish rebellion, ordered Christians⁸ only to be brought to terrible punishments, if they did not deny Jesus as the Christ and blaspheme him.'

In the same book, calling attention to his conversion⁹ from Greek philosophy to the true religion, that it had taken place not irrationally but with deliberation on his part, he writes this: 'For while rejoicing in the teachings of Plato, I heard the Christians being abused, but seeing them fearless in the face of death and of all things thought frightful, I concluded that it was impossible for them to exist in wickedness and libertinism. For what libertine or incontinent person, who thinks feeding on human flesh a good, could welcome death that he might be deprived of his lusts, and would not try by every means to live his present life always and to escape the notice of his rulers, because he would not give himself up to be murdered?'¹⁰

Again, the same writer relates that Hadrian, on receiving a letter in favor of the Christians from Serennius Granianus,¹¹ a most distinguished governor, which among other things stated that it was not just to kill them without any accusation or trial in an attempt to appease the clamors of the people,

⁷ *Ibid.* 1.31.

⁸ He treated the Christians so cruelly also because they were hesitant about taking part in the rebellion.

⁹ The date of Justin's conversion is unknown, but it probably was in his mature years. He probably was a pagan during the greater part of Hadrian's reign.

¹⁰ Justin, *Apol.* 2.12. Eusebius quotes here from what is known today as the 'Second Apology' of Justin, but he evidently knows the two works as one.

¹¹ Nothing more is known of this man except that he was the predecessor of Minucius Fundanus as proconsul of Asia, which we learn from the beginning of the next chapter.

wrote in reply to Minucius Fundanus,¹² proconsul of Asia, ordering him to try no one without an indictment and a reasonable accusation; and he appends a copy of the epistle, preserving the Latin¹³ language in which it was written, and prefacing it with these remarks: 'Although we are able, according to a letter of the greatest and most illustrious Emperor Hadrian, your father, to demand that you order the trials to take place, as we have desired, we have demanded this not as having been ordered by Hadrian, but rather from a knowledge that we demand a request that is just. And we have also appended a copy of Hadrian's letter that you may know that in this also we are speaking the truth, and here it is.'¹⁴

After these words, the author quoted the Latin rescript itself, but we to the best of our ability have translated it into Greek in the following words:¹⁵

Chapter 9

'To Minucius Fundanus. I have received a letter written to me by Serennius Granianus, a most distinguished man, whom

12 The person of the same name addressed by Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 1.9). Melito is quoted by Eusebius (4.26) as calling him proconsul of Asia and as stating that he had received a letter from Hadrian concerning the Christians. The authenticity of this document has been strongly disputed and there is no general agreement on this point among critics.

13 The two existing manuscripts of Justin appear to have substituted the Greek translation of Eusebius for the Latin original. Rufinus, in his version of Eusebius' *History*, gives a Latin version, which may well be the original.

14 Justin, *Apol.* 1.68.

15 Justin, *Apol.* 1.68. It is impossible to judge the faithfulness of this Greek translation, since it is not entirely certain that the Latin of Rufinus is the original.

you succeeded. Now it does not seem well to me to let the matter go without investigation, that men may not be thrown into confusion and no opportunity for villainy be given to informers. If, then, the provincials can clearly back up this petition against the Christians, so as to plead it in a court of law, let them be influenced with a view to this alone and not by opinions or mere outcries. For it was far more fitting, if anyone wished to make an accusation, for you to look into it. If, then, anyone makes an accusation and shows that they are acting contrary to the laws in any respect, decide the case according to the nature of the offence;¹ but, by Hercules, if anyone should bring the matter forward because of blackmail, investigate with regard to his criminality and see to it that you exact punishment.' Such are the words of Hadrian's rescript.

Chapter 10

When, after twenty-one years,¹ Hadrian paid the debt of nature, Antoninus, called Pius, succeeded to the sovereignty of Rome. And when, in the first year of his reign, Telesphorus² departed this life in the eleventh year of his episcopate, Hyginus³ received the lot of the episcopacy over the Romans. Irenaeus relates that Telesphorus was pre-eminent in death through martyrdom, pointing out in the same place that in

¹ This attribution of a spirit of fairness toward the Christians on the part of Hadrian, in the light of what we definitely know of his attitude, seems incredible and throws a strong suspicion of doubt on the authenticity of this epistle.

¹ From August 8, 117, to July 10, 138.

² Cf. above, 4.5. The date which Eusebius gives here (138-139) is probably a year late at least.

³ Very little is known about Hyginus. As Eusebius states (4.11) his episcopate lasted for four years, probably from 137 to 141.

the time of the afore-mentioned Bishop of the Romans, Hyginus, Valentinus, the founder of a special heresy, and Cerdo, the author of Marcion's error, were both well known in Rome. And he writes as follows:⁴

Chapter 11

'Valentinus¹ came to Rome in the time of Hyginus, but he flourished under Pius, and he remained until Anicetus; and Cerdo,² before the time of Marcion³ and in the time of

4 Iren. 3.4.3.

1 Valentinus was the best known and most influential of the Gnostic heretics. He was born, according to Epiphanius (*Haer.* 31), on the coast of Egypt, and was trained in Greek literature and science at Alexandria. He taught in Cyprus before he went to Rome. He was in Rome at least during the reigns of Hyginus (137-141) and Anicetus (154-166), a period of thirteen years. For his errors he was excommunicated, after which he returned to Cyprus, where he continued teaching until he died in 160 or 161. Valentinus declared that he derived his ideas from St. Paul through his disciple Theodas or Theudas, but he was obviously trying to amalgamate the most fantastic notions of Greek and Oriental philosophy with Christian ideas. He drew heavily on Plato. Valentinus holds a very high place in all works on Gnosticism. For excellent accounts on Valentinus and Valentinianism, cf. *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* and the *Cath. Encycl.*, s.v.

2 Known principally as the predecessor of Marcion. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 41) and Philaster (*Haer.* 44) say that he was a native of Syria, and Irenaeus (1.27;3.4) declares that he came to Rome in the episcopate of Hyginus, probably as early as 135. Epiphanius refers to a sect of Cerdonians, but such a sect probably never existed. His followers probably joined those of Marcion, who worked with Cerdo soon after reaching Rome. It is impossible to distinguish the teachings of Cerdo from those of Marcion. Hippolytus (10) considers them together without distinction. Where Cerdo is treated separately (Pseudo-Tertullian's *Adv. haer.* and Epiphanius), he is treated very briefly and his teachings are identical with those of Marcion.

3 Marcion was born about 110 in the Pontus, a province in northeastern Asia Minor, on the Black Sea, the son of the Bishop of Sinope, and went to Rome about 135. He tried to carry out his reforms there, but, being unsuccessful, broke with the Church. He was not strictly a

Hyginus, who was the ninth bishop, having come into the Church and confessed, continued in this way, sometimes teaching his doctrines secretly, sometimes confessing again, sometimes being convicted for his false teaching, and withdrawing⁴ from the assembly of the brethren.' This he says in the third of his books against the heresies. Moreover, in the third book again he relates the following about Cerdo:⁵ 'And a certain Cerdo who had gotten his start from the circle of Simon and had settled in Rome in the time of Hyginus,⁶ who held the ninth place in the episcopal succession from the Apostles, taught that the God preached by the Law and the Prophets was not the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, for the one was known, the other unknown; the one was righteous, the other good.⁷ Marcion of Pontus succeeded him and increased the school, blaspheming without shame.'

Gnostic but, rather, an anti-Jewish reformer. Although he had much in common with the Gnostics, he placed emphasis upon belief rather than upon knowledge. He desired a Christianity undefiled by association with Judaism. Christianity, for him, was the New Covenant pure and simple. He repudiated the Old Testament and all of the New except the Epistles of St. Paul and a mutilated Gospel of St. Luke. For a complete description of Marcion's doctrine and discipline, cf. *Cath. Encycl.*, s.v. The Marcionites existed until well into the Middle Ages, and some of their opinions have never been eradicated. The form of dualism which they derived from the Gnostics resulted eventually in their being absorbed by the Manichaeans.

4 This may well indicate excommunication.

5 Iren. 1.27.1.2.

6 The statement here that Hyginus was the ninth Bishop of Rome is confirmed by Cyprian's epistle to Pompey (*Ep.* 73) and by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 61.1). Other ancient writers call him the eighth, which would probably depend on whether Peter was called the first or whether Cletus and Anaclethus were reckoned as distinct.

7 Marcion thus distinguished the God of the Old Testament and the good or merciful God of the New. According to Pseudo-Tertullian (*Adv. omnes haer.* 6) he taught two Gods, one good, the superior God, and the other cruel, the creator of the world.

The same Irenaeus, most vigorously exposed⁸ the bottomless pit of Valentinus' theory regarding matter with its many errors, and laid bare the wickedness of the man, which was concealed and hidden, as he lurked like a snake in its hole. Besides these men, he says⁹ that there was also another in their time (Marcus¹⁰ was his name), most skilled in the magic arts, and he describes their initiations that did not initiate and their foul mysteries, exposing them in these very words: 'For some of them prepare a nuptial chamber and perform an initiation ceremony with certain invocations over those being initiated, and they say that what is taking place at their hands is a spiritual marriage, according to the likeness of the unions above; others bring them to water, and while baptizing them speak these words, "Into the name of the unknown Father of the universe, into Truth, the mother of all things, into him who descended upon Jesus." Others say Hebrew words in addition, the more to confound those being initiated.'¹¹

But when Hyginus died in the fourth year of his episcopate, Pius¹² took over the government of the Church at Rome. In

8 Iren. 1.1-9.

9 Iren. 1.13.1.

10 On Marcus and the Marcosians, see Irenaeus 1.13-21. Marcus was a Gnostic of the sect of Valentinus. Jerome wrongly calls him a Basilidian (*Ep.* 75.3). Hippolytus and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 34) seem to take their accounts from Irenaeus. Clement of Alexandria knew and used the writings of Marcus. In all probability, Marcus labored in Asia Minor. He lowered the tone of Valentinianism by introducing superstitious magic rites.

11 Iren. 1.21.3=Epiphanius. 34.30.

12 The episcopate of Pius has been set as from 139 to 154 as the earliest possible dates, and from 141 to 156 as the latest, the former termini being the more probable. Great activity marked the Christian community in Rome during the reign of Pius I, during which this community stands out clearly as the center of the Church. According to two sources (the Muratorian Fragment and the Liberian Catalogue), this Pius was the brother of Hermas, the author of the *Shepherd*. The evidence, however, is inconclusive.

Alexandria, Marcus¹³ was appointed pastor, after Eumenes¹⁴ had completed thirteen full years, and, when Marcus after ten years rested from his administration, Celadion¹⁵ took over the administration of the church of the Alexandrians. And in the city of the Romans, when Pius passed away in the fifteenth year of his administration, Anicetus¹⁶ presided over the Christians there. In his time Hegesippus relates that he himself visited Rome and remained there until the episcopate of Eleutherus.¹⁷ In their times Justin¹⁸ was especially prominent, in the guise of a philosopher¹⁹ preaching the word of God and contending for the faith in his writings. And he wrote a work against Marcion²⁰ and mentions that at the time he was writing the man was alive and well known. He speaks thus:²¹ 'And there was a certain Marcion of Pontus, who even today exists teaching his followers to believe that there is another

13 Nothing more is known of this Marcus than is stated here.

14 Cf. above, 4.5.

15 Nothing more is known of Celadion than is stated here and in 4.19. Here Eusebius says that his episcopate lasted for fourteen years.

16 Scholars place his accession between 154 and 156. According to Eusebius, Anicetus reigned for eleven years, until 165 to 167. He was succeeded by Soter.

17 The tradition that Hegesippus came to Rome during the reign of Anicetus has no sound basis. He was already there, as he himself attests; cf. below, 4.22.

18 Eusebius here properly places Justin in the period of Antoninus Pius. He was born about 100 in Flavia Neapolis, and was converted to Christianity about 130. As Eusebius indicates here, he was a great teacher and defender of the Christian religion in Asia Minor and in Rome, where he became a martyr about the year 165. Cf. Introduction to Fathers of the Church 5.

19 The reference here is to the characteristic cloak or mantle of the Greek philosophers, which Justin continued to wear even after he became a Christian. We learn from 6.19 that Heraclas, a friend of Origen, did likewise.

20 This work is lost. We know it only from a brief fragment quoted by Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 4.16.2).

21 Justin, *Apol.* 1.26.

God greater than the Creator; throughout the whole race of men by the aid of demons²² he has made many ²³ blaspheme and deny that the Maker of this universe is the Father of Christ and confess that there is another God greater than He. And all who have their origin from these, as we have said,²⁴ are called Christians, just as the common name of philosophy is applied to philosophers although they have no doctrines in common.' As he goes on, he says:²⁵ 'And we have a book against all the heresies²⁶ that have existed, and we shall give it you, if you care to read it.'

This same Justin labored most skillfully also against the Greeks and addressed other discourses containing an apology for our faith to the Emperor Antoninus, called Pius, and to the Senate of the Romans, for he was spending his life at Rome. In his *Apology* he makes himself clear, who and whence he was, in the following words:²⁷

22 The general belief throughout the early Church was that heresy was an infliction from without through the agency of demons, not a development from within.

23 Strict Gnosticism appealed to philosophers and speculative thinkers and not to the masses. Marcion and his teachings, however, were very popular with all classes, and so were regarded as very dangerous by the early Church.

24 Justin here refers to his own work (*Apol.* 1.7). He tries to make the point that not all who profess to be Christians are really so. The Christians of his time were accused of gross immoralities. He is inclined to lay these at the door of heretics.

25 Justin, *Apol.* 1.26.

26 Eusebius does not mention this work in 4.18, where he lists Justin's works. He undoubtedly never saw it, and it is not now extant.

27 Justin, *Apol.* 1.1.

Chapter 12

'To the Emperor Titus Aelius Hadrian Antoninus Pius, Caesar Augustus, and to Verissimus¹ his son, the philosopher, and to Lucius,² the philosopher, son by nature of the emperor and by adoption of Pius, and to the holy Senate and to the whole people of the Romans, in behalf of the people of every race who are unjustly hated and abused, I, Justin, son of Priscus, the son of Bacchius,³ of Flavia Neapolis in Syrian Palestine, myself being one of them, have composed this address and entreaty.'

And the same emperor, when entreated by other brethren in Asia who were suffering from all manner of insults at the hands of the local population, thought it fit to address the following decree to the Common Council of Asia:⁴

Chapter 13

'The Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus,

- 1 Marcus Aurelius, originally called Marcus Annius Verus. After he was adopted by the Emperor Antoninus Pius, he was called Marcus Aelius Verus Caesar, and because of his sincerity and truthfulness instead of Verus, Verissimus.
- 2 Lucius Ceionius Commodus, of a father of the same name. Along with Marcus, he was adopted as Caesar by Antoninus Pius. Later he became Marcus' colleague in the Empire, and he then to his own name added Verus which Marcus had formerly used. Thus he is generally known in history as Lucius Verus.
- 3 We know nothing more about the father and grandfather of Justin.
- 4 One of the regular provincial councils established by Augustus. It consisted of the civic deputies of the province, and was especially charged with bringing the wishes of the people to the governor and through him to the emperor. The emperors often addressed decrees to it, and received it in audience whenever occasion required. Among other duties it was responsible for the religious life of the province. Cf. Guirand, *Assemblées provinciales dans l'Empire romain*.

Armenicus, Pontifex Maximus, Tribune for the fifteenth time, Consul for the third time, to the Common Council of Asia, greeting.¹ I know that the gods also take care that such men do not escape notice, for they would be much more likely to punish those who are unwilling to worship them than you. These you throw into confusion, having confirmed them in the opinion which they hold by accusing them of being atheists. They might indeed, when accused, prefer apparent death rather than life for the sake of their own god. Therefore, they even come off victorious when they give up their lives rather than obediently perform what you demand. With regard to the earthquakes² that have taken place and are still occurring, it is not improper to remind you that you despair when they take place, and set up a comparison between our situation and theirs. Now they become the more confident in God, but you during the whole of time in apparent ignorance neglect the other gods and the worship of the immortal, and when the Christians worship him³ you oppress and persecute them unto death. But, regarding such men, many of the provincial governors formerly wrote to our most divine father, and he replied that they should not interfere with them, unless they were clearly attempting some plot against

1 This edict, issued between March 7 and December 9, 161 A.D., is usually regarded as spurious, although Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 13.4, tries to defend it as a genuine document with Christian interpolations. It is to be found in cod. Paris. 450 after Justin's *Apology*, and is there assigned to Antoninus Pius, while tribune for the twenty-fourth time, namely, between Dec. 10, 160, and March 7, 161.

2 During the reign of Antoninus Pius many earthquakes occurred in Asia Minor and in Rhodes. These, as well as other misfortunes, such as famines, were the signal for renewing attacks on the Christians who by the common people, were held responsible for these afflictions.

3 Antoninus Pius was an orthodox worshiper of the Roman gods. It is difficult to think of him as calling the God of the Christians 'The Immortal' as opposed to the gods of the Romans.

the government⁴ of the Romans. And many have communicated with me about such men, and I, too, have replied to them in accord with my father's opinion. But, if anyone should persist in taking action against any of such persons, on the ground that he is so, let him who is being accused be freed of the charge, even if it is apparent that he is such, but the accuser will be liable to penalty.⁵ Published at Ephesus in the Common Council of Asia.'

To these events that so happened Melito,⁶ the well-known bishop of the Church at Sardis, gives additional testimony,⁷ as is clear from what he says in the *Apology* which he composed to the Emperor Verus in behalf of our doctrine.

Chapter 14

In the time of the emperors mentioned above, while Anicetus¹ was directing the Church of the Romans, Irenaeus relates that Polycarp,² who was still alive, came to Rome and

4 The reference here is to the rescript apparently addressed by Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus; cf. above, 4.9.

5 This even goes further than Constantine. Not only will the accused be free, but the accuser will be punished; cf. 4.9.

6 On Melito and his works, cf. below, 4.26.

7 This conclusion is drawn apparently from the passage of Melito's *Apology* quoted in 4.26, in which he mentions edicts of Antoninus Pius. These edicts, according to Melito, were intended to continue the policies of Trajan in dealing with Christians and to prevent the introduction of any new procedures of a violent kind. They were not edicts of toleration. It seems that if Melito had really known of any favorable edict such as this by Antoninus, he would have mentioned it.

1 Cf. above, 4.11. The period of his bishopric was probably from 154 to 165.

2 St. Polycarp (69-155) is known to us chiefly from the following sources: the Epistles of St. Ignatius; St. Polycarp's own Epistle to the Philippians; several passages in St. Irenaeus; and the Letter of the

entered upon a conference with Anicetus on some problem regarding the day of the Passover.³ And the same writer presents another account of Polycarp which I must add to what has been said about him. It reads as follows:⁴

From the Third Book of Irenaeus against Heresies

'And Polycarp also was not only instructed by Apostles and lived with many of those who had seen the Lord, but was also appointed by Apostles in Asia bishop in the Church at Smyrna. And him also did we see in our early youth, for he lived a long time and in advanced old age he departed this life gloriously and most illustriously by suffering martyrdom.⁵ He always taught those things which he had learned from the Apostles, and which the Church handed down, and which

Smyrnaeans describing the martyrdom of St. Polycarp. Eusebius takes his account entirely from Irenaeus and from the epistle of the Church of Smyrna, which he quotes in 4.15. Polycarp was the teacher of Irenaeus. He was celebrated not because of his ability and scholarship, but because he lived to a very old age and for many years was among the very few who knew the first generation of Christians. He was a personal disciple of John the Apostle, and was acquainted with others who knew the Lord. There is no doubt about his being Bishop of Smyrna. The only known writing of Polycarp is his letter to the Philippians, which is still extant and in which his character is clearly revealed. He was a very pious and simple Christian with an intense personal love for the Lord, but not at all fanatical. He had an intense horror of heretics, who, he thought, were corrupting the teachings of Christ, yet he seems to have had neither the taste nor the liking to write in refutation of these critics. Although he does not compare with St. Ignatius and others for industry and originality, he was deeply venerated for his deep piety, his connection with John and other disciples of the Lord. His glorious martyrdom also contributed to his fame. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.* and Smith and Wace's *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*

3 Regarding the Paschal controversies, cf. below, 5.1. According to 5.24, Polycarp and Anicetus did not reach an agreement on the question but remained good friends. Polycarp celebrated Mass in Rome at the request of Anicetus.

4 Iren. 3.3.4.

5 For the details of his martyrdom, cf. below, 4.15.

alone are true.⁶ To this all the churches in Asia testify, as well as the successors⁷ of Polycarp down to our own times, he being far more trustworthy and a more reliable witness of the truth than Valentinus and Marcion and the others who have erroneous views. And when he dwelt in Rome in the time of Anicetus, he turned many away from the above-mentioned heretics into the Church of God, proclaiming that this one and only truth which has been passed on by the Church he had received from the Apostles. And there are those who heard from him that John the disciple of the Lord went in Ephesus to bathe and, when he saw Cerinthus within, rushed out of the bath house without having bathed, saying: "Let us flee lest even the bath house cave in, for Cerinthus, the enemy of truth, is within."⁸ And Polycarp himself, when Marcion once met him⁹ and said: "Recognize us," replied: "I do recognize you; I recognize the first-born of Satan." Such care did the Apostles and their disciples take so as not to enter any conversation with any one of those who would mutilate the truth, as Paul also said: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid: knowing that he, that is such an one, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment."¹⁰ There

6 Note the emphasis that Irenaeus places on good tradition for determining sound doctrine. Cf. below, 4.21.

7 Nothing is known of these.

8 Cf. above, 3.28, where the same story is told.

9 Marcion went to Rome some time in 135, but it is not known how long he stayed there. He was regarded by the ancient Fathers as the most dangerous of all the heretics, without doubt because of his success in winning followers from all classes. The bitterness of Polycarp's words indicates the abhorrence held for him. Marcion differs sharply from the real Gnostics in his attitude toward the Church. Whereas the Gnostics held aloof from the Church out of a feeling of superiority and pride, Marcion tried his best to become friendly with her that he might introduce his 'reforms' among her followers.

10 Titus 3.10,11.

is also a very powerful epistle¹¹ of Polycarp's written to the Philippians, from which those who wish and care for their own salvation can learn both the character of his faith and the preaching of the truth.⁷

So much says Irenaeus. Furthermore, Polycarp in the above-mentioned writing of his to the Philippians, which is still in circulation, has made use of some testimonies from the first Epistle to Peter.¹²

Antoninus, called Pius, after completing the twenty-second year of his reign,¹³ was succeeded by Marcus Aurelius Verus, also called Antoninus, his son, together with his brother Lucius.

Chapter 15

At this time,¹ when the greatest persecutions were again disturbing Asia, Polycarp attained perfection by martyrdom, and I think it most necessary to place within the record of this history the account of his death which is still being circulated in writing. The document professes to be from the church over which he himself presided to the parishes of the

- 11 Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* is the only work of his which is still extant. For an English version, cf. *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. 1 of this series. The date of composition is difficult to determine. It could be as late as 135 A.D. Its authenticity has been disputed strongly, but there seems to be no good ground for doubting it, especially since the genuineness of the epistles of Ignatius with which it is closely connected is no longer seriously questioned.
- 12 Polycarp makes abundant use of the First Epistle of Peter, although he never mentions Peter as its author. The references are: 1.3=1 Pet. 1.8; 2.1=1 Pet. 1.13, 21; 2.2=1 Pet. 3.9; 5.3=1 Pet. 2.11; 7.2=1 Pet. 4.7; 8.1=1 Pet. 2.24, 22; 10.2=1 Pet. 2.12.
- 13 Antoninus Pius reigned from July 2, 138, to March 7, 161. Marcus Aurelius and Lucius were two adopted sons.

1 This is undoubtedly a mistake. Polycarp suffered martyrdom in Smyrna during the reign of Antoninus Pius, in 156. Cf. *Studia Biblica*, 2.105ff.

region, describing what befell him in the following words:² 'The Church of God which resides in Smyrna to the Church of God which resides in Philomelium,³ and to all the parishes of the Holy Catholic Church⁴ in every place; mercy and peace and love of God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ be multiplied. We have written to you, brethren, of what happened to those who suffered martyrdom and of the blessed Polycarp, who put an end to the persecution by sealing it, as it were, by his martyrdom.'

Before the narrative about Polycarp, they continue the story in these words,⁵ about what happened to the other martyrs, describing the great firmness which they showed in the face of pains. For they say that those who were standing around were amazed when they saw them at one time being lacerated by scourges even to the innermost veins and arteries, so that the parts hidden within the recesses of their bodies, their entrails and organs, were exposed to view; at another time being laid upon seashells and some sharp points, and going through every form of punishment and torture and finally being given over to wild beasts for food. And they relate that the most noble Germanicus⁶ especially distinguished himself, overcoming with the grace of God the

2 *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 1.

3 An important city in Phrygia Paroreios, not far from Pisidian Antioch.

4 The word 'catholic,' i.e., universal, occurs in the Greek classics, as in Aristotle and Polybius, and was freely used by the earlier Christian writers in what may be called its primitive and non-ecclesiastical sense. The combination, 'the Catholic Church,' appears for the first time in the letter of St. Ignatius to the Smyrnaeans (c. 110). From this time on, the technical and ecclesiastical meaning of the word appears with increasing frequency both in the East and the West. By the beginning of the fourth century it has essentially supplanted the primitive and more general meaning.

5 *Mart. Polyc.* 2-7.

6 Nothing further is known of him.

naturally implanted cowardice of the body in the face of death. And when, indeed, the proconsul⁷ wished to dissuade him and urged his youth and supplicated him, because he was very young and in the flower of youth, to have pity on himself, he did not hesitate but eagerly dragged the beast to himself, all but forcing and provoking him that he might the sooner be freed of their unjust and wicked life. At this man's glorious death the entire multitude, admiring the God-loving martyr for his bravery and the courage of the whole race of Christians, began to shout together, 'Kill the atheists!'⁸ Look for Polycarp.' And when a very great commotion now arose over the shouting, a certain native of Phrygia, Quintus⁹ by name, lately arrived from Phrygia, becoming weakened in face of the wild beasts and the threats besides, was overcome in mind and finally abandoned his salvation. The words of the above-mentioned document showed that he too hastily, but not with a religious spirit, had rushed to the tribunal with others, and so, when convicted, gave clear proof to all that such men should not become daring recklessly and without a religious spirit. Thus did the affairs of these men turn out. But the most admirable Polycarp, when he first heard of these things, remained firm, keeping his mind steadfast and unmoved, and he wished to stay there in the city. But, when persuaded by those about him who begged and entreated him to withdraw, he went forth to a farm not very far from the city and stayed there with a few friends, by night and by day doing nothing but importuning the Lord with prayers, and through them begging and beseeching peace for the churches throughout the world, for this was his unailing custom. And

7 Statius Quadratus, as appears from the latter part of this epistle, a passage which Eusebius does not quote.

8 Cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 1.6; Tertullian, *Apol.* 10; and others. Cf. also above, 4.7.

9 Nothing further is known of him.

now as he prayed, in a vision three days before his capture, he saw at night the pillow under his head suddenly seized by flame and so destroyed, and thereupon, when awakened, all but predicted the future and clearly announced that it was necessary for him to depart this life in fire for Christ's sake. So, when those who were seeking him were pressing on with all zeal, they say that, again being constrained by his affection and love of the brethren, he went over to another farm. Then, not very much later, his pursuers came up and seized two of the slaves there, and one of these they tortured and by him were led to Polycarp's abode, and coming up late in the evening they discovered him lying in an upper chamber, whence he could have gone over to another house but would not, saying: 'The will of the Lord be done.'¹⁰ And when he learned that they were at hand, as the story goes, he went down and conversed with them easily with a very bright and gentle countenance, so that those who did not know him before seemed to behold even a miracle, as they looked upon his advanced age and his gravity and steadfastness of manner, and they marveled that there should be so much effort for the capture of an old man of such character. He did not delay, but immediately ordered that a table be set for them; then he invited them to partake of a bountiful meal, and asked them for an hour that he might pray undisturbed. When they had given permission, he arose and prayed, being full of the grace of the Lord, so that those who were present were amazed as they heard him pray, and many of them already repented that such a venerable and godlike man was about to be killed.

Besides this, the document regarding him goes on with the rest of the account literally as follows:¹¹ 'And when at last

¹⁰ Acts 21.14.

¹¹ *Mart. Polyc.* 8-19, but Eusebius has abbreviated the passage.

he finished his prayer, after remembering all who had ever met up with him, both small and great, famous and obscure, and the whole Catholic Church throughout the world, since the time had come for departure, they set him upon an ass and brought him into the city, it being a great Sabbath.¹² And the captain of the police, Herod, and his father Nicetes,¹³ met him, and, after removing him into their carriage, they sat by his side and tried to persuade him, saying: "For what harm is it to say, 'Lord Caesar,' and to offer sacrifice, and to be saved?" At first he did not answer, but, when they persisted, he said: "I do not intend to do what you advise me." And having failed to persuade him, they uttered terrible words and turned him out in such a hurry that as he got down from the carriage he scraped his skin. But without turning around, as if he had suffered nothing, he proceeded promptly and rapidly, and was led to the stadium. And while the uproar in the stadium was so great that this was not heard by many, a voice from heaven did come to Polycarp as he entered the stadium:¹⁴ "Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man." And no one saw him who spoke, but many of our people heard the voice. So when he was brought forward, there was a great uproar from those who heard that Polycarp had been arrested. Then, finally, when he approached, the proconsul asked if he was Polycarp, and when he admitted it, he tried to persuade him to deny, saying: "Have regard for your age," and other things after these, which they are accustomed to say: "Swear by the genius of Caesar, repent, say: 'Away with the atheists.'" And when the governor pressed him and said: "Swear, and I shall release you: revile Christ," Polycarp said: "For eighty-six

¹² The traditional date of the martyrdom of Polycarp was February 23. According to this, 'a great' Sabbath could be the feast of Purim or the Sabbath after the Passover.

¹³ Nothing further is known of these men.

¹⁴ Cf. Jos. 1.9; Acts 9.7.

years have I served Him, and He has done me no wrong, and how can I blaspheme my King who saved me?" And when he again persisted and said: "Swear by the genius¹⁵ of Caesar," he said, "If you vainly suppose that I shall swear by the genius of Caesar, as you say, pretending not to know who I am, hear openly: I am a Christian. And if you wish to learn the doctrine of Christianity, name the day and listen." The proconsul said: "Persuade the people." And Polycarp said:¹⁶ "You I had thought worthy of discussion, for we have been taught to render honor, as is proper, to princes and authorities appointed by God, if it harms us not; but as for those, I do not think it worthy that defense be made to them."¹⁷ And the proconsul said: "I have wild beasts; I shall throw you to them unless you repent." And he said: "Call them, for repentance from better to worse must not be made by us, but it is noble to turn from wickedness to righteousness." And he again said to him: "I shall cause you to be consumed by fire, if you look down upon wild beasts, unless you repent." Polycarp said: "You threaten a fire that burns for a time and after a little is extinguished, for you do not know the fire of the judgment to come and of eternal punishment that is reserved for the wicked. But, why do you delay? Carry out what you wish." And saying these and many other things, he was filled with courage and joy, and his face was suffused with grace, so that he did not fall, although disturbed by

15 This form of oath was devised under Julius Caesar, and was continued under his successors. The Christians regarded the 'genius' of the emperor as a false god and so repudiated the oath as a form of idolatry. Thus, pagan magistrates used this oath very commonly as a test during periods of persecution. Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* 32; Origen, *Contra Cels.* 8.65; and many others.

16 Cf. Rom. 13.1ff.; 1 Pet. 2.13ff.

17 The proconsul made a concession and would have been glad to have Polycarp quiet the multitude, but did not wish to take the chance of possible failure and preferred to maintain his dignity and not to appear to ask for mercy.

what was being said to him; on the other hand, the proconsul was amazed and sent the herald to announce in the midst of the stadium "Polycarp has confessed three times that he is a Christian." When this was said by the herald, the entire multitude of heathens and Jews¹⁸ who inhabited Smyrna cried out with unrestrained wrath and with a great shout: "This man is the teacher of Asia, the father of the Christians, the overthrower of our gods, the one who teaches many not to sacrifice and not to worship." While saying this, they shouted and asked Philip the Asiarch¹⁹ to let the lion loose on Polycarp. But he said that it was not lawful for him to do so, since he had closed the games. Then they decided with one accord to cry out that Polycarp should be burned alive. For the vision which appeared to him when praying, on seeing his pillow burn, must be fulfilled, and he turned to the faithful with him and said prophetically: "I must be burned alive." Now, these things happened with such great speed, quicker than it takes to tell, and the crowds suddenly brought together from the shops and the baths wood and faggots, the Jews being especially zealous, as is their wont, in lending a hand at this. When the fire was made ready, he took off all his outer garments and loosened his girdle and he tried also to take off his shoes, although he had never done this before, because each one of the faithful was always eager which of them might touch his skin first; in every circumstance, because of his good life, even before his grey hairs came, he had been treated with great respect. The material made ready for the fire now was quickly placed about him, and when they were about to nail

18 The Jews seem very often to have been the leading spirits in the persecution of Christians. Cf. 2.25; 5.16; also, Tertullian, *Scorp.* 10.

19 An Asiarch was the head of the confederation of the leading cities of the province of Asia. By virtue of this office he was the 'chief priest' of Asia, and 'president of the games.' Philip the Asiarch was a Trallian, according to a statement toward the end of the epistle, not quoted by Eusebius.

him to the stake as well, he said: "Leave me thus, for He who grants me to endure the fire will also grant that I remain in it unmoved, without the security that will result from your nails." They did not nail him, but they bound him. He put his hands behind him and he was bound like a noble ram being offered out of a great flock as a burnt offering acceptable to God Almighty,²⁰ and he said: "O Father, of thy beloved and blessed Child, Jesus Christ, through whom we have received knowledge about Thee, the God of angels and powers and of all creation and of the entire race of the righteous who live in Thy presence, I bless Thee because Thou has deemed me worthy of this day and hour, to receive a portion in the number of the martyrs, in the cup of Thy Christ, unto resurrection of eternal life,²¹ both of soul and of body, in the immortality of the Holy Spirit. Among these may I be received in Thy presence today in a rich and acceptable sacrifice, just as Thou, the God who does not lie and is truth, has made ready and made clear and has fulfilled. Therefore do I also praise Thee for all things, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee through the everlasting high priest, Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Child, through whom be glory to Thee with Him in the Holy Spirit, both now and for the ages to come, Amen." And after he had offered up his Amen and had finished his prayer, the men in charge of the fire lit the fire, and when a great flame blazed forth we saw a marvel, to whom it was granted to see, who also have been preserved to relate the events to the others. The fire gave the appearance of a room, like the sail of a vessel being filled with wine, and it made a wall about the body of the martyr, and it was in the middle of it not like burning flesh but like gold and silver being refined

20 Cf. Wisd. 3.6.

21 Cf. John 5.29.

in a furnace,²² for we perceived such a fragrant odor as of the fumes of frankincense or of some other of the precious spices. Then, at last, when the lawless men saw that the body could not be consumed by the fire, they ordered an executioner²³ to approach and plunge a sword in him, and when he had done this a flood of blood came forth so that the fire was extinguished and the entire throng wondered if there was any such difference between the unbelievers and the elect. And of the elect this man was indeed one, the most wonderful teacher of our time, apostolic and prophetic, who was bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna. For every word which he uttered from his mouth both was fulfilled and will be fulfilled.

‘But the jealous and envious evil one who opposes the race of the righteous, on seeing the greatness of his martyrdom, and his blameless life from the beginning, and his being crowned by the crown of immortality, and his carrying off the unspeakable price, took care that not even his poor would be received by us, although many desired to do so, and to have fellowship with his holy flesh. So some secretly suggested to Nicetes, the father of Herod, and the brother of Alce, that he ask the governor not to give up his body, “lest,” he said, “giving up the crucified one, they begin worship of this man.”²⁴ And they said this at the secret suggestion and insistence of the Jews, who also watched as we were about to take him from the fire, not knowing that we shall never be able either to abandon Christ, who suffered for the salvation of those who are saved in the whole world, or to worship any other. For we worship this one who is the Son of God, but the martyrs we love rightly as disciples and imitators of the Lord because of their unsur-

²² Cf. Wisd. 3.6.

²³ It was the regular duty of the executioner (*confector*) to deal the death blow to such beasts as had not succumbed in the arena.

²⁴ Note how highly the early Christians venerated the martyrs.

passable affection for their own King and Teacher, and may it be that we become their companions and fellow disciples. So, when the centurion saw the contentiousness that had arisen from the Jews, he placed him in the midst, as was their custom, and burned him, and so we later gathered up his bones that were more valuable than precious stones and more to be esteemed than gold, and we placed them where it was suitable. There, as it is possible, the Lord will permit us to come together in gladness and in joy to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom²⁵ for the memory of those who have already contested and for the training and preparation of those who shall do likewise. Such are the experiences that befell the blessed Polycarp, who suffered martyrdom with those from Philadelphia, the twelfth martyr in Smyrna, who alone is especially remembered by all, so that he is spoken of repeatedly in every place, even by the heathen.'

Of such an end was the life of the marvelous and apostolic Polycarp deemed worthy, as the brethren of the church at Smyrna have recorded the story in their epistle which we have quoted. In the same document about him, other martyrdoms which took place in Smyrna at the same time as the martyrdom of Polycarp are appended, and among these Metrodorus, who seems to have been a presbyter of the error of Marcion, was destroyed by being given over to fire. Moreover, a famous martyr of those at that time was Pionius. The document concerning him includes his successive confessions and his boldness of speech and his apologies for the faith in the presence of the people and the rulers and his instructive addresses and also his greetings to those who succumbed to temptation during the persecution and the consolations which

²⁵ Probably the earliest reference to the annual celebration of the day of a martyr's death, a practice which became common very early in the history of the Church. Cf. also, Tertullian, *De corona* 3.

he applied to the brethren who visited him during his imprisonment, and, in addition to these, the tortures which he endured, and also the pains and nailings and his firmness in the fire and, after all his marvelous deeds, his death. We shall refer those who are interested to this document which is included among the martyrdoms of the ancients we have collected. And, next, there are in circulation memoirs of others who were martyred in the city of Pergamon in Asia: Carpus and Pappylas and a woman, Agathonice, who after very many and illustrious confessions gloriously met death.

Chapter 16

In the time¹ of these martyrs also, Justin, whom we mentioned a little above,² addressed a second book in behalf of our doctrines to the rulers already named and was adorned with divine martyrdom³ when a philosopher, Crescens⁴ (this

1 During the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, 161-169.

2 In 4.11.

3 Tradition is unanimous in saying that Justin died a martyr. Irenaeus in *Adv. haer.* 1.28.1 is the first to mention it, which he does as if it were something well known. It occurred about the year 165. We have an account of his martyrdom (*Acta SS.*, April, II, 104-19; Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum* [Jena 1879] III 266-78; *PG* 6.1565-72), which, though two or more centuries later, seems to be authentic. The end of the examination is as follows: 'The Prefect Rusticus says: Approach and sacrifice, all of you, to the gods. Justin says: No one in his right mind gives up piety for impiety. The Prefect Rusticus says: If you do not obey, you will be tortured without mercy. Justin replies: That is our desire, to be tortured for our Lord, Jesus Christ, and so to be saved, for that will give us salvation and firm confidence at the more terrible universal tribunal of our Lord and Saviour. And all the martyrs said: Do as you wish, for we are Christians, and we do not sacrifice to idols. The Prefect Rusticus read the sentence: Those who do not wish to sacrifice to the gods and to obey the emperor will be scourged and beheaded according to the laws. The holy martyrs glorifying God betook themselves to the customary place, where they were beheaded and consummated their martyrdom confessing the Saviour.'

man emulated the life and manners characterized by the name of cynic), concocted the plot against him, for Justin often defeated him in debate in the presence of listeners, and finally by his martyrdom he won the crown of victory for the truth which he preached.

This, too, he himself, the supreme philosopher of truth, in the above-mentioned *Apology* sets forth in advance, just as clearly as if, indeed, it were just about to happen to him, in the following words:⁵ 'So I, too, expect to be plotted against by someone of those named and to be shaken upon the rack, or even by Crescens who loves not wisdom but boasting, for it is not right to call the man a philosopher, who bears public testimony about what he does not know, testifying that the Christians are atheistic and impious,⁶ and doing this for the favor and pleasure of the many who have been deceived. For, if without reading the teachings of Christ he controverts us, he is completely depraved and much worse than the uneducated, who often avoid discussing and bearing false testimony about matters of which they are ignorant; and if he has read them and does not grasp the greatness in them or, understanding them, he does this to avoid suspicion of being in agreement, he is far more ignoble and entirely depraved, for he is subject to ignorant and unreasonable opinion and fear. I would have you know that, when I proposed and asked him some such questions, I discovered and proved that he truly knows nothing,⁷ and to show that I speak the truth, if the disputations have not been brought to your attention, I am ready even in your presence to share the questions again, and this indeed would be a task for an emperor. But, if my

4 A cynic philosopher. All that we know about him comes from Justin and Tatian, who paint him in the blackest colors. Eusebius seems here to be drawing on Tatian.

5 Justin, *Apol.* 2.3; *Chron. Pasch.* 484.10-483.7.

6 A common accusation against the Christians of the second century.

7 *Chron. Pasch.* 482.10-483.7.

questions and his answers are known to you, it is clear to you that he knows nothing of our affairs; or, if he knows, but dares not speak because of his listeners, as I said before, the man is proved not a lover of wisdom but a lover of reputation, who does not even respect the saying of Socrates,⁸ although it is worthy of affection.⁹

These things, then, does Justin say. And that, according to his prophecy, he was caught by Crescens and met his death, Tatian,⁹ a man who early in his life became wise in the learning of the Greeks and acquired no small reputation in them and left a great many monuments of himself in his writings, narrates in the following words in his work against the Greeks: 'And the most wonderful Justin rightly exclaimed that the aforesaid persons were like robbers.'¹⁰ Then, saying something about the philosophers, he continues as follows: 'Now Crescens, who lurked in the great city, surpassed all in his unnatural lust, and was completely devoted to the love of money. He who counseled to despise death so feared death himself that he intrigued to overcome even Justin by death,

8 The saying of Socrates which Justin quotes at this point and Eusebius omits is from Plato's *Republic* Book 10. 595C and reads: 'a man must be honored before the truth.' Perhaps Eusebius thought that it was too well known to need quoting.

9 Cf. Tatian, p. 36, 26. Tatian was a second-century apologist about whom nothing is known with certainty except that he was born in Assyria and was trained in Greek philosophy. Repelled by the immorality of paganism and attracted by the holiness of the Christian religion and the sublime and simple nature of the Scriptures, he became a Christian about 150. He joined the Christian community in Rome and became a 'hearer' of Justin. As long as Justin lived, Tatian remained orthodox. In about 172, however, he became a Gnostic of the Encratite sect, and returned to the Orient. Only two of his works are extant. His *Oratio ad Graecos* is an apology for Christianity, very bitter and denunciatory, expressing the greatest contempt for Greek philosophy and manners. The other extant work, the *Diatasseron*, is a harmony of the four Gospels containing a continuous narrative of the principal events in the life of the Lord. Several other works written by Tatian are lost.

10 Tatian, p. 20, 15-17.

as if it were a great evil, because Justin by preaching the truth proved the philosophers to be gluttons and imposters.¹¹ Such was the cause of the martyrdom of Justin.

Chapter 17

The same man recalls in his first¹ *Apology* others who suffered martyrdom before his own contest, relating these events in a manner profitable to our subject, and he writes as follows:² 'A certain woman lived with a dissolute husband, she herself also at first being dissolute. But when she became acquainted with the teachings of Christ, she was chastened, and she tried likewise to chasten her husband, repeating the teachings and announcing the punishment in eternal fire that will come to those who do not live soberly and with right reason. But he continued in the same dissoluteness and by his actions estranged his wife; for his wife thought it wicked to consort with a husband who tried means of pleasure in every way contrary to the law of nature and to righteousness, and she wished to be separated from the marriage. And when she was importuned by her relatives to continue to remain with him, counseling that her husband would some day come upon hope of change, she forced herself to remain. But when this woman's husband went to Alexandria, he was reported as acting worse, and, in order not to become a party to his injustices and impieties while remaining in wedlock and sharing in his board and bed, she gave him what among you is called a bill of divorce and was separated. But although her

¹¹ Tatian, p. 21, 1-6.

¹ Eusebius knew the two *Apologies* of Justin as one. What he refers to here as the first is really the second *Apology*.

² Justin, *Apol.* 2.2.

gentlemanly husband should have rejoiced that she had given up those acts which she had recklessly committed with servants and hirelings, rejoicing in drunkenness and every evil, and wished him to cease doing the same things, since she had separated from him against his wish, he brought a charge against her, declaring her to be a Christian. She filed a petition with you, the emperor, requesting that she be permitted to settle her affairs first and then, after the settlement of her affairs, to make her defense against the accusation, and this you granted. But he who had once been her husband, being no longer able to prosecute her, in the following way turned against a certain Ptolemy,³ who had been her teacher in Christian doctrines and whom Urbicius had punished. He persuaded a centurion, who was a friend of his, to cast Ptolemy into prison, and to seize and ask him this one thing alone, whether he was a Christian. And when Ptolemy, who was truth-loving and not of deceitful or false disposition, confessed that he was a Christian, the centurion had him put in chains and punished him for a long time in jail. Finally, when the man was led before Urbicius, he was asked this very question alone, whether he was a Christian; and again, being conscious of his blessings through Christ's teaching, he confessed his schooling in divine virtue. For, he who denies at all either is a denier because he despises the fact or avoids confession because he knows that he is unworthy and alien to the fact, neither of which is characteristic of a true Christian. When Urbicius ordered him to be led off to punishment, a certain Lucius,⁴ himself also being a Christian, on seeing the verdict which had been made so unreasonably, said to Urbicius: "What is the reason for your having punished this man, who

• 3 All that is known of this Ptolemy is contained in this passage. His martyrdom in all probability took place as early as 152.

4 Nothing further is known of him.

has not been convicted of being either an adulterer, or a fornicator, or a murderer, or a thief, or a robber, or of having committed any wrong at all, but of having confessed that he bears the name of Christian? You do not judge, Urbicius, in a manner befitting the Emperor Pius or the philosopher-son⁵ of Caesar or the sacred Senate." And without making any other reply, he said to Lucius: "You, too, seem to me to be such a one," and, when Lucius said: "Certainly," he ordered him also to be led away to punishment. Lucius granted that he was grateful, for he added that he was being removed from such wicked rulers and was going to the good Father and King, God. And when a third man came forward, he, too, was condemned to be punished.' To this Justin naturally and fittingly adds those words of his which have been quoted above,⁶ saying: 'I, too, then expect to be plotted against by someone of those names,' etc.⁷

Chapter 18

This Justin has left us a great many records from an intellect trained and practiced in theology, which are filled with every kind of helpful information, to which we shall refer the studious, pointing out those which have advantageously come to our knowledge.¹ He has a certain treatise² addressed

⁵ Marcus Aurelius.

⁶ Cf. above, 4.16.

⁷ Justin, *Apol.* 2.3. These words directly follow the long passage quoted just above.

¹ Eusebius goes on to mention only such works of Justin which he himself has seen, which may account for his omission of the work against Marcion, mentioned above, 4.11.

² This is the genuine *Apology* of Justin, now extant as two, although originally one and so known to Eusebius. Eusebius in his *Chronicle* says that it was written in 141, but most critics would place it ten or more years later, before the death of Antoninus Pius (161).

to Antoninus, surnamed Pius, and to his sons and to the Senate of the Romans in behalf of our doctrines; another, including a second *Apology*³ for our faith, which he composed to the successor and namesake of the above-mentioned emperor, Antoninus Verus, the affairs of whose time we are at the present moment discussing; and another *Against the Greeks*,⁴ in which, after a long-drawn-out discussion about most of the questions at issue between us and the philosophers of the Greeks, he treats of the nature of demons, which there is no urgency to quote for the present. And still another work of his against the Greeks has come to us, which he entitled *A Refutation*, and besides these another *On the Sovereignty of God*,⁵ which he compiled not only from our own Scriptures but also from the books of the Greek. Besides these, there is a work entitled *Psaltes*⁶ and another disputation *On the Soul*, in which, after propounding various questions on the problem under discussion, he quotes the opinions of the Greek philosophers, against which he promises to make a refutation and to quote his own opinion in another work. He also composed a dialogue against the Jews⁷ which he held in the city of

3 As in 4.16, Eusebius here ascribes to Justin a second *Apology*, from which he never quotes. Tradition has always spoken of two *Apologies* as having been written by Justin. The existing two, however, were known to Eusebius as one, and the genuine second has disappeared. This seems to have taken place after the eleventh century, when his one genuine *Apology* was divided into two by later copyists. Thus we still apparently have two *Apologies* by Justin.

4 The two works *Against the Greeks* mentioned probably were truly those of Justin. The two existing works of this name are the productions of later writers and not to be identified with those indicated by Eusebius.

5 No longer extant. The existing work of the same name ascribed to Justin is a writing by a later author.

6 This and the following works were genuine works of Justin, but they have entirely disappeared.

7 Genuine and extant today, written during the reign of Antoninus Pius (137-161). Of Trypho we know only what we gather from the dialogue itself.

Ephesus with Trypho, a most distinguished Jew of the time.⁸ In this he shows how divine grace stimulated him to the word of the faith, what zeal he formerly applied to philosophical studies, and how deep and ardent an investigation he had made of the truth. In the same work he records about the Jews how they organized a plot against the teaching of Christ, pressing these very points against Trypho: 'Not only have you not repented of the evil which he did, but you selected picked men at that time and sent them out from Jerusalem into the whole world, saying that an atheistic sect of Christians had appeared and making the same charges against us that all those who are ignorant of us make, so that from the first you are responsible for the unrighteousness not only to yourselves but also to absolutely all other men.'⁹

And he writes also¹⁰ that even down to his time prophetic gifts shone in the Church, and he mentions (Justin, *Dial.* 81) the Apocalypse of John, saying clearly that it belongs to the Apostle;¹¹ and he mentions certain words of the prophets making a charge to Trypho that Jews had cut them out of Scripture. A great many other works of his are still circulation among many brethren,¹² and the discourses of the man were thought to be so worthy of study even to the ancients that Irenaeus quotes his words, for example, in the fourth book *Against Heresies*, using these very words: 'And well does Justin say in his work against Marcion that he would not have believed the Lord himself had he preached another

8 Justin, *Dial.* 2-8.

9 *Ibid.* 17.

10 *Ibid.* 82.

11 *Ibid.* 71-73.

12 Except for the seven works mentioned by Eusebius, the work *Against Marcion* quoted by Irenaeus just below, and the *Syntagma contra omnes haer.*, all the extant and non-extant works attributed to Justin are probably spurious.

God than the Creator.¹³ And in Book 5 of the same work he says this in the following words:¹⁴ 'And well did Justin say that before the coming of the Lord Satan did not dare to blaspheme God,¹⁵ for he did not yet know his condemnation.' These words I have felt obliged to say to stimulate the studious to investigate the arguments of this man zealously. So much, then, about this man.

Chapter 19

Now, in the eighth year¹ of the above-mentioned reign, Soter² succeeded Anicetus as Bishop of Rome, who had completed eleven years in all. But when Celadion had presided over the diocese of Alexandria for fourteen years, Agrippinus³ took up the succession.

Chapter 20

In the church of the Antiochians, Theophilus¹ was known as the sixth from the Apostles, for Cornelius² was the fourth

¹³ Iren. 5.6.2.

¹⁴ Iren. 5.26.2. Irenaeus does not mention the name of the work of Justin which he is quoting here. The sense of the quotation, however, seems to point to the same work, *Against Marcion*.

¹⁵ The same thought is expressed by Epiphanius in *Haer.* 39.9.

¹ In 168.

² Cf. 4.11 for these names.

³ All that is known of him is told here and in 5.9, where Eusebius states that he held office for twelve years. St. Jerome (*Chron.*) agrees with this, but places his accession in the sixth year of Marcus Aurelius.

¹ Cf. below, 4.24 n.

² We know nothing about the careers of Cornelius and Eros. Eusebius (*Chron.*) places the accession of Cornelius in the twelfth year of Trajan (128), and the accession of Eros, his successor, in the fifth year of Antoninus Pius (142).

of these, having been established after Hero,³ and after him, in fifth place, Eros succeeded to the episcopacy.

Chapter 21

There flourished in these times in the Church, Hegesippus,¹ whom we know from what has preceded, and Dionysius, Bishop of the Corinthians, and Pinytus, another bishop in Crete, and besides these, Philip and Apolinarius and Melito and Musanus and Modestus and above all Irenaeus,² from

³ Cf. above, §36.

¹ Hegesippus has already been mentioned in 2.23; 3.11, 16.20, 32; 4.8. On his writings, cf. 4.22. On the other names given here, cf. 4.23-28.

² Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, was born in Proconsular Asia or in some province bordering on it, some time in the first half of the second century, probably between 120 and 130. While still very young, he had seen and heard Polycarp (d. 153) at Smyrna. During the persecution of Marcus Aurelius, he was a priest of the Church at Lyons. The clergy of that city, many of whom were in prison for the faith, sent him to Rome (177 or 178) with a letter concerning Montanism for Pope Eleutherius (cf. below, 5.1.5). On returning to Gaul, Irenaeus succeeded the martyr, St. Pothinus, as Bishop of Lyons (cf. 5 *praef.* and 1). During the religious peace that followed the persecution of Marcus Aurelius, Irenaeus divided his energy between being a pastor and being a missionary. In 190 or 191 he interceded with Pope Victor to lift the sentence of excommunication laid by that pontiff on those Christian communities of Asia Minor that persisted in the practice of Quartodecimene regarding the celebration of Easter (cf. 5.23). He died at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century; some would place it rather definitely in 202 or 203. In all probability he did not die a martyr, in spite of considerable evidence, all of which is rather late. His feast is celebrated on July 28th in the Latin Church, and on August 23rd in the Greek.

Irenaeus wrote in Greek many works which have given him an exceptionally high place in Christian literature. He was the most important polemical writer in antiquity, his works forming a source from which all subsequent writers on heresies drew. Eusebius quotes him very frequently as a source of prime importance for events of the second century, and treats him with profound respect as one of the greatest writers of the early Church. St. Jerome, in his *De vir. ill.*, devotes an unusually long chapter (35) to him, but says nothing that

whom the sound and orthodox faith of the apostolic tradition has come to us in writing.

Chapter 22

Now, Hegesippus,¹ in the five treatises that have come

we cannot learn from Eusebius' *History*. None of the writings of Irenaeus has come to us in the original Greek text. Two of his works, however, have come down to us complete in other languages. The first is commonly known as *Adversus haereses* in five books, and is devoted, according to its true title, to *The Detection and Overthrow of the False Knowledge*. The scrupulous fidelity of this Latin version is beyond doubt. This work is of the highest importance because it contains a profound exposition not only of Gnosticism in its various forms, but also of the chief heresies sprung up in the different Christian communities. When refuting the heresies, Irenaeus often opposes to them the true doctrines of the Church, and thus gives positive and very early evidence of high importance. The second work is entitled *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, and aims not to refute heretics but to strengthen the faithful by expounding the Christian teaching to them, and especially by demonstrating the truth of the Gospel by means of the prophecies of the Old Testament. This was written after the *Adversus haereses* and has reached us in an Armenian version. Of the other works of Irenaeus, many of which are mentioned by Eusebius, only a few fragments or mere titles have been preserved. Eusebius mentions a special work against Marcion (4.25; 5.20). Irenaeus' epistle *On Schism*, addressed to Blastus, one *On Sovereignty*, addressed to Florinus, and a treatise *On Ogdoad*, cf. 5.20. For his epistle to Victor regarding the paschal dispute, and other epistles on the same subject, cf. 5.24. Eusebius mentions four other works of Irenaeus in 5.26. Besides these works of Irenaeus mentioned by Eusebius, a number of fragments have come down to us supposedly from others of his writings. Some of these are undoubtedly genuine, others not. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.*, s.v. Irenaeus.

- 1 The five books of St. Hegesippus (Roman Martyrology, April 7) are lost. A few fragments have been preserved by Eusebius, and one by Photius. His work appears to have been a collection of reminiscences of the apostolic and post-apostolic ages. They were drawn from written and oral sources, and in part also from personal observation. They were put together unsystematically and in no way represent historical composition. The date of Hegesippus is established by his statement that the death and deification of Antinous took place in his own day (130), that he came to Rome under Anicetus (154-7 to 165-8), and wrote in the time of Eleutherus (174-6 to 189-91).

down to us, has left us a very complete record of his own opinion. In these he shows that he traveled as far as Rome and mingled with a great many bishops, and that he received the same doctrine from all. It is well to listen to what he said after some remarks about the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians: 'And the church of the Corinthians remained in the true word until Primus² was Bishop of Corinth. I associated with them on my voyage to Rome and I spent some days with them in Corinth, during which we were mutually stimulated by the true Word. And while I was in Rome I made a list of succession up to Anicetus,³ whose deacon was Eleutherus,⁴ and Soter succeeded Anicetus, and after him Eleutherus.⁵ In each list and each city all is as the Law, the Prophets, and the Lord preach.'

The same author also describes the beginnings of the heresies of his time in these words: 'And after James the Just suffered martyrdom, just as the Lord and for the same reason, Symeon, his cousin, the son of Clopas⁶ was appointed bishop, whom they all proposed because he was another cousin of the Lord. For this reason they called the Church virgin, for she had not yet been corrupted by vain discourses. But Thebouthis,⁷ because he was not made bishop, begins to corrupt it by seven heresies,⁸ to which he belonged, among the people.⁹ Of these heresies were Simon,¹⁰ whence the Simonians; and

2 Nothing further is known of him.

3 Cf. above, 4.11.

4 Cf. 4.19.

5 Cf. 5 *Praef.*

6 Cf. 3.32.

7 We know Thebouthis only from the information given here. The reason given here for his apostasy has little credence, since the same reason is given frequently to explain the origin of heresies.

8 As given below.

9 'The people' (*laos*) usually means the Jews, but here it apparently refers to the Christians of Palestine.

10 Simon Magus; cf. above, 2.13.

Cleobius,¹¹ whence the Cleobians; and Dositheus,¹² whence the Dosithians; and Gorthaeus,¹³ whence the Goratheni and the Masbothei. From these came the Menandrianists¹⁴ and the Marcionists and the Carpocratians and the Valentinians and the Basilidians and the Saturnilians; each one in his own peculiar and different way introduced a peculiar opinion; and from these came false Christs, false prophets, false apostles who divided the unity of the Church by their destructive doctrines against God and against His Christ.'

The same author also describes the heresies that once arose among the Jews, saying: 'And there were different opinions among the circumcision, among the children of the Israelites, against the tribe of Judas and the Christ. These were: Essenes, Galileans, Hemerobaptists, Masbothei, Samaritans, Sadducees, and Pharisees.'¹⁵

He also wrote a great deal more, which in part we have already quoted, introducing the narratives in an appropriate chronological order, and he draws on the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac and particularly from the Hebrew language, showing that he himself had been converted from

- 11 Cleobius is sometimes mentioned by ancient writers as a heretic, but nothing more is said of him than is said here.
- 12 Little is known of Dositheus. He was one of the numerous Samaritan false messiahs, who lived about the time of Christ or even before.
- 13 Although Epiphanius and Theodoret mention the Goratheni, they tell us nothing more than Hegesippus does here. Epiphanius places them among the Samaritans, and Theodoret says that they evolved from Simon Magus. Nothing more is known of the Masbothei.
- 14 On Menander and the Menandrianists, cf. 2.26; on the Carpocratians, 2.7; on the Valentinians, 2.11; on the Basilidians and the Saturnilians, 2.7.
- 15 Hegesippus referred to these seven Jewish heresies above. Justin (*Dial.* 80) gives seven different ones: Sadducees, Genistae, Meristae, Galileans, Hellenianians, Pharisees, Baptists. Epiphanius mentions four Samaritan sects: Gorothenes, Sebouaiioi, Essenes, Dositheans, and seven Jewish sects: Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, Hemerobaptists, Ossaioi, Nazarenes, Herodians.

the Hebrews,¹⁶ and he mentions other matters as being from the unwritten tradition of the Jews. And not only this author, but also Irenaeus,¹⁷ and the whole company of the ancients, called the Proverbs of Solomon the all-virtuous Wisdom. And when discussing the so-called Apocrypha, he records that some of these were tampered with by certain heretics in his own time. But now we must pass on to another writer.

Chapter 23

We must say first about Dionysius¹ that he was given the throne of the episcopate of the diocese of Corinth, and that he shared his inspired industry ungrudgingly not only with those under him but also with those of foreign lands, making himself most useful to all in the Catholic epistles which he arranged for the churches, among which the one to the Lacedaemonians² is an instruction on orthodoxy and an

16 There is no reason to doubt this statement. It is to be noted, in support of Eusebius here, that Hegesippus evolves the Christian heresies from Jewish, and not, as other writers do, from pagan sources. There is no reason, however, as some do, to believe that Hegesippus was a Judaizer.

17 Iren. 4.20.3.

1 He is without foundation called a martyr by the Greek Church, and a Confessor by the Latin Church. All that is known about this Dionysius is related by Eusebius. He was Bishop of Corinth about 170. Eusebius speaks here of seven Catholic epistles and of one addressed to an individual. None of these is extant, although Eusebius gives us four interesting fragments from the *Epistle to the Romans*. Dionysius had a very high reputation in his time as a writer of letters. We do not know when Dionysius died, but he was not living in 199, since Bacchylus was Bishop of Corinth at the time; cf. below, 5.22.

2 This is probably the earliest reference to a church in Lacedaemon or Sparta.

admonition to peace and unity; the epistle to the Athenians is a stimulus to faith and life according to the Gospel, for belittling which he all but rebukes them for apostatizing from the Word, ever since it happened that he who was over them, Publius,³ suffered martyrdom during the persecutions of that time. He recalls that after the martyrdom of Publius Quadratus⁴ was established as their bishop, and he testifies that by his zeal they were brought together and took on a revival of faith. And he indicates, besides, that Dionysius⁵ the Areopagite, after being converted to the faith by the Apostle Paul, according to what is indicated in the Acts,⁶ was the first to be entrusted with the episcopacy of the diocese at Athens. And another letter of his to the Nicomedians⁷ is in circulation, in which he combats the heresy of Marcion and compares it with the canon of the truth. He wrote also to the church that sojourns in Gortyna⁸ together with the other Cretan dioceses, and he welcomes their bishop, Philip,⁹ inasmuch as the church under him was approved for a great many acts of virtue, and he warned them to be on guard against the errors of the heretics. And he also wrote to the

3 Nothing more is known than is stated here. He probably suffered martyrdom in the reign of Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius.

4 This Quadratus is to be distinguished from the apologist mentioned above, 4.3. It would appear from Eusebius' words that he was bishop when Dionysius was writing.

5 On Dionysius the Areopagite, cf. above, 3.4.

6 Acts 17.34.

7 Note that Dionysius in this epistle to the Nicomedians deems it necessary to attack Marcionism, another of many indications in the literature of the period of the rapid spread of this sect. Dionysius' widespread influence is indicated by his writing an epistle to a church so far away as Nicomedia.

8 The most famous city of Crete, where important inscriptions giving complete knowledge of the Cretan dialect of the Greek language have been found. According to tradition, Titus was its first bishop.

9 Our knowledge of this Philip, Bishop of Gortyna, and a contemporary of Dionysius, is limited to what Eusebius tells us here and in Ch. 25.

church sojourning at Amastris,¹⁰ together with those in Pontus, and he recalls Bacchylides¹¹ and Elpistus¹² as having urged him to write, and he has added explanations of the divine Scriptures, indicating their bishop, Palmas¹³ by name; and he gives many exhortations to the same regarding marriage and chastity, and he commands them to receive those who turn back from a fall or from a failure or from heretical error.¹⁴ Among these has been included another letter to the Cnossians,¹⁵ in which he exhorts Pinytus,¹⁶ bishop of the diocese, not to place upon the brethren a heavy and compulsory burden with regard to chastity,¹⁷ but to have consideration for the weakness of the multitude. On replying to this letter, Pinytus admires and welcomes Dionysius, but exhorts¹⁸ him in turn to provide at some time more solid food, again nourishing the people under him with another more advanced letter, so that they might not be fed continually on milky words and unwittingly arrive at old age under the treatment of children. Through this letter the orthodoxy of Pinytus in the faith and his concern for the welfare of those under him and his learning and his knowledge of theology are revealed as by a most accurate image.

Another letter of Dionysius, one to the Romans, is extant,

10 This is the first mention of a church at Amestris, a city in Pontus.

11 Possibly to be identified with the later Bishop of Corinth, Bacchylus; cf. below, 5.22.

12 Otherwise unknown.

13 Cf. below, 5.23. He presided, as senior bishop, at a council of bishops of Pontus, toward the close of the century, on the Paschal question.

14 This policy of mildness toward excommunicated offenders anticipates a later practice of the Church, although an innovation at this time. It is also in accord with Dionysius' recommendation to Pinytus.

15 Cnossus was the capital city of Crete. The epistle is no longer extant.

16 The knowledge of Pinytus is confined to this chapter and in 4.20.

17 Cf. Matt. 11.30.

18 Cf. 1 Cor. 3.1,2; Heb. 5.12-14.

addressed to a bishop of that time, Soter.¹⁹ There is nothing better than to quote passages from it, by which he welcomes the custom of the Romans which has been preserved down to the persecution of our times, and he writes as follows: 'For from the beginning it has been your practice to do good in various ways to all the brethren and to send contributions to many churches in every city, thus relieving the poverty of the needy and ministering to the Christians in the mines,²⁰ by the contributions which you have made from the beginning, preserving as true Romans the ancestral custom of the Romans. Your blessed Bishop Soter has not only maintained this custom but has even increased it, ministering the abundance distributed to the saints, and with blessed words urging his brethren who come to Rome, as a loving father his children.'

In this same letter he also mentions Clement's letter to the Corinthians,²¹ showing that from the beginning according to an old custom it was read in the church. He says: 'Today we have observed the holy Lord's day, in which we have read your letter. Whenever we read it, we shall always be able to gain profit, just as we also do when we read the earlier letter written to us by Clement.'

Again, the same author says the following²² about his own letters which have apparently been falsified: 'When the brethren asked me to write letters, I wrote them. And these the apostles of the Devil have filled full of tares,²³ cutting some things out and putting others in. Woe is in store for these. Surely it is not surprising that some have eagerly desired to

19 Cf. above, 4.19.

20 The Romans consistently used the mines as convict centers. They regarded work in them unfit even for slaves.

21 Cf. above, 3.16.

22 Cf. Matt. 13.25.

23 Cf. Apoc. 22.18,19.

falsify even the Lord's writings,²⁴ when they have plotted against such inferior writings as mine.'

Besides these, still another letter of Dionysius is in circulation, addressed by him to Chrysophora,²⁵ a most faithful sister. In this he writes on one thing after another, and imparts to her proper spiritual nourishment. So much we take from Dionysius.

Chapter 24

Of Theophilus,¹ whom we have mentioned as Bishop of the Church of the Antiochians,² three elementary works addressed to Autolycus are in circulation, and another with the title, *Against the Heresy of Hermogenes*,³ in which he has made use of passages from the Apocalypse of John, and

24 A reference to Marcion and others who in this period interpolated and mutilated the works of the Apostles to fit their own teachings.

25 Otherwise unknown.

1 Of the early Eastern writers, Eusebius alone mentions Theophilus and his writings. Of the Latin Fathers, Lactantius and Gennadius refer to the *Ad Autolycum* of Theophilus, which is still extant; Jerome devotes *De vir. ill.* 25 entirely to him. We have no other reliable ancient testimony on him. Eusebius in the present passage and Jerome make Theophilus the sixth Bishop of Antioch; Jerome in his letter *Ad Algas* calls him the seventh bishop, counting the Apostle Peter as the first. He probably became bishop about 181 and died between 189 and 192. Besides the works mentioned by Eusebius here, Jerome speaks of *Commentaries* on the Gospel and the Book of Proverbs. In his letter *Ad Algas*, Jerome speaks also of a harmony of the four Gospels by Theophilus. These works mentioned by Jerome are not extant. The existing Latin *Commentary on the Gospels* in four books, bearing the name of Theophilus, is not genuine. The apology, in three books, addressed to Autolycus, demonstrates the falsehood of idolatry and the truth of Christianity. The writer shows himself to be well-versed in Greek philosophy and skillful in the use of literary style of a high order. In *Ad. Autol.* 2.30 Theophilus speaks of a work of his *On History*, but this work is lost.

2 Cf. above, 4.20.

3 This work has disappeared.

certain other books of his on instruction⁴ are also in circulation. But, since even then the heretics were no less defiling the pure harvest of apostolic teaching like tares,⁵ and the shepherds of the churches everywhere were driving them off, as if a kind of wild beast, from the sheep of Christ, they kept them away at one time by admonitions and exhortations to the brethren, at another by contending more openly against them with unwritten personal investigations and inquiries, and again by correcting their opinions with most accurate proofs through written treatises. It is clear, indeed, that Theophilus with the rest contended against these with a work of no mean merit which he composed against Marcion,⁶ which has been preserved to our day, together with the others which we have mentioned. Maximus,⁷ the seventh from the Apostles, succeeded this one as bishop of the Church of the Antiochians.

Chapter 25

Philip, whom from the words of Dionysius¹ we know as Bishop of the diocese in Gortyna, himself also made a very elaborate treatise against Marcion.² Irenaeus³ and Modestus,⁴

4 These catechetical works are now lost.

5 Cf. Matt. 13.25.

6 St. Jerome places this work first in his list of Theophilus' writings. It is not extant today, although St. Jerome says that it was in his day. No other Father mentions it.

7 This name appears in the *Chronicle* as Maximus. He was bishop from c. 181 to c. 192. Nothing else is known of his life.

1 Cf. above, 4.23.

2 Not extant. It is not mentioned by any other Father. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 30) merely quotes Eusebius here.

3 Cf. above, 4.21.

4 Our information on Modestus comes from the passage in 4.21 and from Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 32). Jerome states that the work was extant in his day but says nothing about it. He mentions other works by Modestus, all of which have been lost.

who excelled more than the others in bringing the error of the man out in the open for all to see, did likewise, and there are many more whose labors are preserved even today among a great many of the brethren.

Chapter 26

Besides these, Melito,¹ Bishop of the diocese of Sardis, and Apolinarius,² Bishop of Hierapolis, also flourished exceedingly, and each of these addressed treatises in behalf of the faith in his own way to the above-mentioned emperor³ of the Romans of that time. The following works of these have come to our knowledge. Of Melito,⁴ two books *On the Passover*, the work *On Christian Life and the Prophets*, and the treatise *On the Church* and the one *On the Lord's Day*, and one besides that *On the Faith of Man*, and the one *On*

1 Melito, Bishop of Sardis, first comes to our attention in the letter addressed by Polycrates to Bishop Victor of Rome, supporting the Quartodeciman practice of the churches of Asia Minor (c. 190-202). This letter, quoted in part below (5.24), states that 'Melito the eunuch (interpreted as 'the virgin' by Rufinus in his translation of Eusebius) whose whole walk was in the Holy Spirit,' was buried at Sardis. He himself also favored the Quartodeciman practice. We learn from this chapter and from 6.13 that he was a very prolific writer. Very few of the Fathers quote Melito's works, and Eusebius does little more than mention their titles. He wrote his *Apology* during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, but after his brother Lucius had died (after 169). It probably was his last work; it happens also to be the last on Eusebius's list. We know nothing about the dates of his episcopacy or about his predecessors and successors in the see of Sardis. A number of spurious writings are extant under his name. On Melito and his writings, cf. Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*; also, *Cath. Encycl.*

2 Cf. below, 4.27.

3 Marcus Aurelius (161-180).

4 The following list is very uncertain, due to the various readings of the manuscripts and versions.

Creation,⁵ and that *On the Obedience of Faith*, and that *On the Senses*,⁶ and besides these that *On the Soul and the Body*⁶ and *On Baptism and Truth and Faith and Christ's Birth*,⁷ and a treatise on His prophecy⁸ and *On the Soul and the Body* and the one *On Hospitality and the Key*, and the books *On the Devil and the Apocalypse of John*, and the treatise *On God Incarnate*, and, above all, the little book *To Antoninus*.⁹

Now, in the book *On the Passover*, he indicates the time when he was composing it by beginning with these words: 'In the time of Servilius Paulus,¹⁰ proconsul of Asia, at the time when Sagaris¹¹ suffered martyrdom, there was a great discussion in Laodicea concerning the Passover, which fell according to season in those days, and this work was written.' Clement of Alexandria recalls this treatise in his own treatise *On the Passover*,¹² which he says he composed because of the writing of Melito. And in the book to the emperor he relates that some such things as the following happened to us under his rule: 'For that which never before happened, the race of the religious is now being persecuted and driven throughout Asia by strange decrees. For the shameless informers and lovers of

5 This title arises from a radical revision of the text. The Greek words corresponding to 'and that On' are added without manuscript support.

6 Some manuscripts add 'or mind,' probably a gloss upon the word 'soul,' as has been suggested.

7 Probably the chapters of a single work.

8 This appears to be the meaning of a very corrupt text.

9 I.e., Antoninus Verus, otherwise known as Marcus Aurelius. This *Apology* is assigned to the tenth year of Marcus Aurelius (120).

10 Not known. Rufinus emended the name to Sergius Paulus, consul for the second time in 168, and probably proconsul of Asia about 164-166.

11 Cf. below, 5.24, where a Sagaris, bishop and martyr, is mentioned by Polycrates in his epistle to Victor, as buried in Laodicea. This is probably the same person. No more is known about him.

12 The work of Clement was written against the work of Melito, and is no longer extant. For some brief fragments of it, cf. below, 6.13.

other people's property take advantage of the decrees and openly pillage us, despoiling those who have done no wrong by night and by day.' After making other points, he says: 'If this is done at your command, let it pass as well done, for a righteous king would never make unrighteous plans, and we gladly endure the honor of such a death. But we bring to you this request alone, that you yourself examine the authors of such strife, and judge righteously whether they are worthy of death and punishment or of safety and immunity. But, if this counsel and new decree, which is not proper even against barbarian enemies, be not from you, we beg you much more not to overlook us in the midst of such lawless plundering by the mob.' And he adds to this by saying:¹³ 'Our philosophy first flourished among the barbarians, but it came to flower among your peoples under the great rule of your ancestor Augustus, and it became an omen of good especially for your Empire, for from that time the power of the Romans increased extensively and brilliantly. You are now his happy successor and you will continue to be together with your son,¹⁴ as long as you protect the philosophy that grew up with the Empire and came into existence with Augustus, which, too, your ancestors respected along with the other religions, and this is the greatest proof that our doctrine flourished for good along with the Empire happily begun, the fact that it met no evil since the reign of Augustus, but, on the contrary, everything splendid and glorious in accord with the prayers of all.¹⁵ Alone of all the emperors, Nero and Domitian, being

¹³ The same thought underlies this quotation from Melito's *Apology* and Tertullian's *Apology* 5, namely, the emperors in general protected Christianity; Nero and Domitian, the most wicked of them, alone persecuted it; Christianity has been a boon to the reigns of all the better emperors. Without doubt, Tertullian had known the *Apology* and other works of Melito.

¹⁴ I.e., Marcus Aurelius and his son, Emperor Commodus.

¹⁵ But Augustus was dead a considerable time before the establishment of the Christian Church.

won over by certain malicious men, have wished to slander our doctrine, and from these have arisen the lie and the unreasonable practice of falsely accusing Christians.¹⁶ But your pious fathers corrected their ignorance, often rebuking many in writing, whenever they dared to take new measures regarding Christians. Among these, your grandfather Hadrian evidently wrote to many, and especially to the proconsul Fundanus,¹⁷ who was governor of Asia, and your father, even when you were administering the world with him, wrote to the cities about taking no new measures against us. Among these writings are those to the Larisians and to the Thesalonians and Athenians and to all the Greeks.¹⁸ Since you have the same opinion as they about Christians and, indeed, much more benevolent and philosophic, we are persuaded that you will do all that we ask of you.⁹

Now, these passages are found in the above-mentioned treatise, but in the *Extracts*¹⁹ written by him the same author, as he begins his introduction, makes a list of the recognized scriptures of the Old Testament, and I feel obliged to give this list here. His words are as follows: 'Melito to his brother Onesimus,²⁰ greetings. Since you have often asked, in your zeal for the true word, that selections be made for you from the Law and the Prophets regarding the Saviour and all our faith, and, furthermore, since you wished to learn with accuracy about the ancient books, how many they are in number and how they are arranged, I have endeavored to do just this, knowing your zeal for the faith and your eagerness for knowledge about the Word, and that, as you

16 It was a common belief among pagans that the Christians were responsible for all the misfortunes of the Roman people, even earthquakes, floods, famines, and others.

17 Cf. above, 4.9.

18 Cf. above, 4.13. They are no longer extant.

19 A collection of testimonies to Christ and Christianity, taken from the Old Testament. The only part extant is this portion taken by Eusebius from the preface.

20 Otherwise unknown.

struggle for your eternal salvation, you judge these matters most important of all in your yearning for God. Accordingly, when I went East and was in the place where these things were preached and practiced, and after I had learned the books of the Old Testament accurately and had set down the facts, I sent them to you. Their names are these: five Books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Josue the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, four Books of Kingdoms, two Books of Chronicles, the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon and his Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Job, the Prophets Isaias, Jeremias, the Twelve in a single Book, Daniel, Ezechiel, Ezra. I have made extracts from these, and I have arranged them in six books.' Such is the statement of Melito.

Chapter 27

Of the many writings of Apolinarius¹ which are preserved by many, the following are those which have come down to us: a treatise to the emperor² mentioned above and five books *Against the Greeks*,³ and Books 1 and 2 *On Truth*,⁴ 1 and 2 *Against the Jews*, and the books that he wrote after these against the heresy of the Phrygians, which had begun its innovations long before but at that time was, as it were, beginning to sprout, while Montanus with his false prophetesses⁵ was making the beginnings of their error.

1 St. Apolinarius Claudius, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, some time in the second century. He undoubtedly wrote other works than those mentioned here, but none is extant. He published his Apology for the Christians in 177, and in it he appealed to the emperor's personal experience with the 'Thundering Legion,' by whose prayers he won his victory over the Quadi. The date of his death is unknown. His feast is observed on January 8th.

2 Marcus Aurelius.

3 Nicephorus (*H.E.* 4.11), who probably speaks from personal experience, says that it was written in the form of a dialogue.

4 Entirely unknown to us.

5 Cf. below, 5.14-19.

Chapter 28

And of Musanus,¹ whom we have listed among the foregoing writers, a very eloquent discourse is in circulation which he addressed to certain brethren who had fallen away to the heresy of the so-called Encratites,² which at that time had just begun to spring up and was introducing into life a strange and pernicious false doctrine.

Chapter 29

Report has it that Tatian was the originator of this error, whose words regarding the marvelous Justin we introduced a little above,¹ relating that he was a disciple of the martyr. Irenaeus makes this clear in the first of his books *Against the Heresies*, at the same time writing about him and his heresy as follows:² "Those who are called Encratites and spring from Saturninus³ and Marcion preached against marriage, rejecting the original creation of God and tacitly condemning Him who made male and female for the creation of mankind, and they introduced abstinence from what were called by them "animate" things, thereby showing ingratitude to the

1 Nothing further is known of him; subsequent historians only copy Eusebius on Musanus. Here and in Ch. 21, Musanus' activity is assigned to the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Thus, he would be a contemporary of Melito, Apolinarius, and Irenaeus, among others.

2 Regarding Tatian and the Encratites, cf. above, 4.16 n. 9. This sect seems to have taught a doctrine of asceticism much like that of the later Manichaeans. The name is derived from the Greek *enkrateia*, 'continence.'

1 Cf. above, 4.16.

2 Iren. 1.28.1.

3 Regarding Saturninus and Marcion, cf. above, 4.7; on asceticism, cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.24.

God who made all things, and they denied the salvation of the first created man. This innovation they discovered recently when a certain Tatian introduced this blasphemy. He was a hearer of Justin, and as long as I was with him expressed nothing like this, but, after the martyrdom of Justin, he left the Church and became exalted with the thought of becoming a teacher and puffed up by the conviction that he was superior to others. He composed his own peculiar type of doctrine, inventing certain invisible aeons as the followers of Valentinus did, and like Marcion and Saturninus rejected marriage as corruption and fornication, but the denial of the salvation of Adam he devised by himself.' Thus did Irenaeus write at that time, but a little later a certain Severus by name strengthened the above-mentioned heresy and became responsible for those who get their start from him, receiving the name of Severiani⁴ which was derived from him. Now, they make use of the Law and the Prophets and the Gospels, although they interpret the ideas of the sacred Scriptures in their own way. But they blaspheme Paul the Apostle, and reject his Epistles, and do not even accept the Acts of the Apostles. But their former leader, Tatian, composed a kind of combination and collection of the gospels, I know not how, to which he gave the name *Diatessaron*,⁵ and this is in

4 The Severians were strict abstainers from flesh, wine, and marriage. That they were connected with Tatian and his Encratites seems quite erroneous. There probably was no such person as Severus. He appears to have been a fictitious character invented to explain Severiani, as Ebion was to explain Ebionites. The Severians were definitely anti-Pauline, which at once distinguishes them from Tatian and his group. These heretics are not mentioned in earlier works against heresies, and the source of Eusebius's knowledge of them is unknown.

5 From the manner in which Eusebius speaks of the *Diatessaron* we judge that he never saw it. At any rate, he is the first to mention the work, and we do not hear of it again until the time of Epiphanius (*Haer.* 46.1), who identifies it with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, but appears to know it only by hearsay.

circulation even today among some. And it is said that he had the effrontery to paraphrase some words of the Apostle,⁶ as if he were correcting the grammatical structure of the expression. This has left a great number of writings, of which his celebrated treatise *Against the Greeks*⁷ is especially quoted by many. In this he treated the earliest times and showed that Moses and the Prophets of the Hebrews were older than all the celebrated men among the Greeks.⁸ This work seems to be the most polished and most helpful of all his works. Such are the facts regarding this man.

Chapter 30

In the same reign, as heresies multiplied in Mesopotamia, Bardesanes,¹ a very able man and very eloquent in the Syrian

6 St. Paul. This passage implies that Tatian wrote a work on the Epistles of St. Paul.

7 Still extant and one of the most interesting of the early apologies. It was probably written after Tatian left Rome for the first time, about 152 or 153. As mentioned above, it is rabidly anti-Greek.

8 Tatian treats this subject in *Oratio* 31,35-41. Largely because of these chapters was Tatian's *Oratio* held in such repute, and his other works slighted and lost.

1 Bardesanes or Bardaisan, a Syrian poet, astrologist, and Gnostic philosopher. He was born on July 11, 155, and died in 223. Although born and reared a pagan, at the age of twenty-five he happened to hear the homilies of Hystaspes, Bishop of Edessa, and, after receiving instruction, was baptized, and even admitted to the diaconate or the priesthood. One critic, Hort, well says: 'There is no reason to suppose that Bardesanes rejected the ordinary faith of the Christians as founded on the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles, except on isolated points. The more startling peculiarities of which we hear belong for the most part to an outer region of speculation, which it may easily have seemed possible to combine with Christianity, more especially with the undeveloped Christianity of Syria in the third century. The local color is everywhere prominent. In passing over to the new faith Bardaisan could not shake off the ancient glamour of the stars, or abjure the Semitic love of clothing thoughts in mythological forms.' He was a

tongue, composed dialogues against the Marcionites and certain others who were responsible for differing opinions, and he has handed them down in his own tongue and script, along with many others of his writings. Those who knew him (and they were very many, for he was very strong at arguing), have translated these works from the Syriac language into Greek. Among these is his very powerful dialogue addressed to Antoninus, *On Fate*, and such others as they say that he wrote on the occasion of the persecution of that time.² This man was formerly of the school of Valentinus, but, having condemned this school and having refuted most of his fictions, he himself thought that somehow he had changed to the more correct opinion; however, he had not entirely washed off the filth of the old heresy.³

At this time, moreover, Soter, Bishop of the Church at Rome, died.

voluminous writer. The following of his writings are worthy of mention: *Dialogues* against Marcion, against Valentinus, and *Against Fate* (addressed to Antoninus); *Book of Psalms*, 150 in number, in imitation of David's Psalter; astrological treatises; a *History of Armenia*; and an account of India. The work known as *Book of the Laws of the Countries* is not by Bardesanes himself, but by a certain Philip, his disciple. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.*

- 2 Caracalla spent the winter of 216 in Edessa, and put Prince Bar Manu in prison. The emperor may have allied himself with a party discontented with the rule of that prince, and thereby started a pagan reaction. This may have been the occasion of the persecution referred to here, in which Bardesanes proved himself firm in the faith.
- 3 Eusebius seems to speak here from personal knowledge. It may well have been that Bardesanes, after abandoning Valentinianism, still kept some of the views acquired under its influence, and thus affected all of his subsequent thinking.

BOOK FIVE

Introduction

NOW, SOTER,¹ BISHOP of the Church at Rome, died in the eighth year of his rule. Eleutherus,² as twelfth after the Apostles, succeeded him, and it was the seventeenth year³ of the Emperor Antoninus Verus. In this time, as the persecution against us was rekindled more violently in certain parts of the world, as a result of the attack of the populace in the cities it is possible to ascertain that myriads were distinguished by martyrdom, judging from what happened in one nation. These events have by chance been handed down to posterity, being truly worthy of unceasing remembrance. The entire account, with its very complete description of these events, has been placed in our collection of the martyrs,⁴ and it includes not only an historical but

1 Cf. above, 4.19.

2 St. Eleutherus, or Eleutherius, (Pope, c. 174-189, although the dates of his reign are open to question), is mentioned in connection with Hegesippus, above, 4.11,22, and is of great interest in connection with Irenaeus and the Gallican martyrs (5.4) and his stand with reference to the Montanist controversy (5.3). Bede (*Hist. eccles.* 4), wholly without foundation, connects Eleutherus with Christianity in Great Britain.

3 In 177.

4 The *Acts of the Martyrs* which Eusebius collected; cf. Introduction.

also an instructive narrative. I shall for the present select and quote such material as may have some connection with the present treatise. Now, other authors, when composing historical narratives, have handed down in writing exclusively victories of wars, and trophies won from enemies, and the exploits of generals, and valor of soldiers, stained with blood and with countless murders for the sake of children and of fatherland and other possessions. But our historical narrative of those who order their lives according to God will inscribe those who have been valiant in most peaceful wars for the true peace of the soul, and in these more for truth than for fatherland, more for piety than for their dear ones, upon everlasting monuments, proclaiming for everlasting memory the struggles of the athletes of piety and their valor that tried so much and the trophies won from demons and victories over unseen opponents and crowns placed upon all their heads.

Chapter 1

Now, Gaul was the country in which the arena for what is being described was prepared. Its capital cities, famous and surpassing the others of the land, were heralded as Lyons and Vienne,¹ through both of which the Rhone River passes, flowing in an ample stream about the entire country. The most renowned churches of this country sent the account of the martyrs² to the churches in Asia and Phrygia, in this way recording what took place among them, and I shall present their own words: "The servants of Christ sojourning in

1 Ancient Lugdunum and Vienna, the modern Lyons and Vienne in southeastern France.

2 This word is used here and in following chapters for all those who suffered in persecution, whether they lost their lives or not. It might well be translated 'witnesses.'

Vienne and Lyons in Gaul to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia who have the same faith and hope of redemption as we. Peace and grace and glory from God the Father and Jesus Christ, our Lord.³

Then, after other remarks by way of preface, they make the beginning of their communication in these words: 'Now, the greatness of the affliction here and the extent of rage of the heathen against the saints and the many sufferings endured by the blessed martyrs we are unable to describe accurately nor, indeed, can they be put down in writing. For with all his might the Adversary has fallen upon us, already giving us a foretaste of his coming which is to take place without restraint, and he has tried in every way to practice and train his own against the servants of God, so that we are not only excluded from houses and baths and market place but the passing appearance of anyone of us is forbidden in any place whatsoever. But the grace of God led us and strengthened the weak and arrayed in opposition steadfast pillars of men able through patience to draw all the attack of the wicked one upon themselves,⁴ and they closed with the wicked one, enduring every kind of abuse and punishment,⁵ and, counting much little, they were zealous for Christ, showing truly that

3 The remains of this epistle are preserved for us by Eusebius in this and the next chapter. It bears all the marks of authenticity and its genuineness has never been questioned. We may assume with confidence that all of the epistle that touches on the martyrdoms has been preserved. The persecution depicted was undoubtedly the severest suffered by the Christians up to that time, but was quite insignificant when compared with the persecutions under Decius and Diocletian. It is of great interest to note that the epistle is addressed to the Christians of Asia Phrygia. Many of the people of Asia Minor migrated to Southern Gaul and many prominent Christians of Gaul had pursued their higher studies in Asia Minor. The relationship between the Christians of these two regions seems to have been very close, especially at the time of this epistle. Quite without foundation, Irenaeus has been suggested as its possible author.

4 Cf. 1 Tim. 3.15.

5 Cf. Heb. 10.33.

the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed to us.⁶

'First, they endured nobly what was heaped upon them everywhere by the mob, howls and blows and draggings around and plunderings and stone-throwings and imprisonments and all things that usually take place at the hands of an infuriated multitude against its supposed enemies and foes; and then they were dragged into the market place by the tribune,⁷ and they were examined in the presence of the entire multitude by the tribune and by the chief authorities of the city, and they confessed and were locked up in prison until the coming of the governor. Afterwards, when they were brought before the governor and he employed all cruelty against us, Vettius Epagathus,⁸ one of the brethren, intervened, as one filled with love for God and for neighbor, whose life was passed so strictly that, although he was young, his reputation equaled that of the elder Zacharias.⁹ He had indeed walked in all the commandments and justifications of the Lord without blame, and was unwearied in all his ministration to his neighbor, having much zeal for God and being fervent in spirit. Being of such a character, he did not endure the judgment which was made so unreasonably against us, but he became exceedingly angry and demanded that he, too, be heard as he presented a defense for his brethren, pointing out that there was nothing atheistic or impious in us. When those about the judgment seat cried out

6 Cf. Rom. 8.18.

7 The Greek word is *chiliarch*, which was regularly used by the Greeks to translate the Latin *tribunus militum*.

8 The following are mentioned in this chapter as martyrs or witnesses: Vettius Epagathus, Sanctus, Attalus, Blandina, Biblias, Pothinus, Maturus, Alexander, Ponticus. All that is known about them is contained in this epistle. It is highly probable that Vettius was of a noble family and actually did suffer martyrdom.

9 The father of John the Baptist, as is indicated by the reference to Luke 1.6. in the next line.

against him, for he was a man of distinction,¹⁰ and the governor refused to tolerate his request which was so just, but merely asked this, if he himself also was a Christian, when the man confessed in a very clear voice, he, too, was taken away into the ranks of the martyrs, being called "advocate of Christians," although he had the Advocate within himself, the spirit of Zacharias¹¹ which he exhibited by the fullness of his love, when he consented to lay down even his own life¹² for the defence of the brethren, for he was and is¹³ a true disciple of Christ, following the Lamb wheresoever He goes.¹⁴

The rest were then divided, and the first martyrs were manifestly ready, and they finished the confession of martyrdom with all eagerness; but others appeared not to be ready and to lack training and to be still weak and unable to endure the strain of a great struggle, and of these about ten in number proved to have been born out of time. These caused us great grief and immeasurable pain, and damaged the zeal of the others who had not been arrested. Although they suffered all the terrors, they continued to remain with the martyrs and did not desert them. But then, we were all greatly terrified because of the uncertainty of their confession, not because we feared the punishments that were being applied, but because we looked to the end and feared that someone would fall away. But day by day those who were worthy were being arrested, filling up their number, so that from the two churches all the zealous and those by whom our affairs were especially held together were gathered up. And certain heathen servants of ours were also arrested, for

10 The inference is that because of his social position his advocacy of Christians was the more irritating.

11 Cf. Luke 1.67; 1 John 3.16.

12 Cf. John 15.13; 1 Thess. 2.8.

13 Some, quite incredibly, have taken this 'is' to indicate that Vettius was not actually put to death.

14 Cf. Apoc. 14.4.

the governor had publicly ordered all of us to be examined. These, by a snare of Satan, since they feared the tortures which they saw the saints suffer, when the soldiers urged them on to this, falsely accused¹⁵ us of Thyestean feasts and Oedipodean intercourse¹⁶ and such acts as it is not right for us either to repeat or to think about or even to believe that any such thing had ever happened among men. When these accusations were uttered, all became like wild beasts toward us, so that, even if formerly through friendship some were lenient, they then became greatly enraged and gnashed their teeth against us,¹⁷ but that which was spoken by our Lord was being fulfilled, "the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you, will think that he doth a service to God."¹⁸ Then, finally, the holy martyrs endured punishments beyond all description, as Satan strove to wring some blasphemy even from them. And all the wrath of the mob and of the governor and of the soldiers beyond all measure fell upon Sanctus,¹⁹ the deacon from Vienne, and against Maturus, very much of a novice but a noble contender, and on Attalus, a Pergamene²⁰ by race, who had always been a pillar and a bulwark²¹ for the Christians there, and against Blandina, through whom Christ pointed out that the things among men which appear mean and

15 According to Roman law, a slave could not be compelled to testify against his master. A slave could, however, if he so desired, thus testify as here either through fear or any other cause.

16 According to classical mythology, Thyestes had unwittingly eaten his own children, served to him by an enemy at a banquet, and Oedipus had unknowingly married his own mother. Terrible accusations of this kind were commonly made against the Christians in antiquity. Cf. above, 4.7.

17 Cf. Acts 7.54.

18 John 16.2.

19 Although a deacon of the church at Vienne, he suffered martyrdom at Lyons. Clearly, the church at Vienne, as well as that at Lyons, was directly involved in the persecution.

20 Further evidence that the Christians of Gaul and Asia Minor were very close.

21 Cf. 1 Tim. 3.15.

obscure and contemptible with God are deemed worthy of great glory²² because of the love for Him shown in power and not boasted of in appearance. For, while we all feared, and her mistress in the world, who was herself also one of the contenders among the martyrs, was in distress lest she be not able even to make her confession boldly because of weakness of body, Blandina was filled with so much strength that she was released and those who tortured her in relays in every manner from morning until evening became exhausted, even confessing of their own accord that they were beaten, since they had nothing further to do to her, and that they marveled at the fact that she was still alive, for her whole body was broken and opened, and that they testified that one form of torture was enough to drive out life, to say nothing of the different nature and number of the tortures. But the blessed woman, like a noble athlete, renewed her strength in the confession, and her comfort and rest and release from the pain of what was happening to her was in saying: "I am a Christian woman and nothing wicked happens among us."

'Sanctus himself also nobly endured beyond all measure and human endurance all the ill-treatment of men. When the wicked hoped through persistence and the severity of the tortures that they would hear something from him which should not be said, he resisted them with such firmness that he did not even tell his own name nor of what race or city he was, nor whether he was a slave or free, but to all their interrogations he answered in the Latin language: "I am a Christian." This he confessed for name and for city and for race and for everything in succession, and the heathen heard no other word from him. Accordingly, there was great eagerness on the part of the governor and the torturers to subdue him, so that, finally, when they had nothing more to do to him,

²² Cf. 1 Cor. 1.27, 28.

they fastened plates of heated brass to the tenderest parts of his body. And these were burning, but he himself remained unbending and unyielding, strong in his confession, refreshed and strengthened by the heavenly spring of the water of life which comes forth from the belly of Christ.²³ And his body was a witness of what happened to him, being all one wound and bruise, wrenched and torn out of human shape,²⁴ and Christ suffering in him manifested great glory, routing his Adversary and for the example of the rest showing that there is nothing to be feared where there is love of the Father and nothing painful where there is Christ's glory.²⁵ For, when the wicked after some days again tortured the martyr and thought that, while the body was swollen and inflamed, if they should supply the same tortures, they would overcome him, since he could not bear the touch of the hand, and that if he should die because of his tortures, he would instill fear in the others, not only did no such thing happen to him, but, contrary to men's expectation, he arose and his body during subsequent tortures was straightened up and regained its former appearance and the use of its limbs, so that by the grace of Christ the second torture became for him not a torture but a cure.

'Now, the Devil, thinking that he had already consumed Bibbas, also, one of those who had denied, and wishing to condemn her by blasphemy²⁶ likewise, brought her to torture, trying to force her to say impious things about us, as if she were already beaten and weak. But she recovered during the torture, recalling through the temporal punishment the eternal torment of hell, and she contradicted the blasphemers, saying: "How would such men eat children, when it is not even per-

²³ Cf. John 7.38.

²⁴ Cf. Isa. 53.25.

²⁵ Cf. Tim. 1.16.

²⁶ I.e., against Christians, as is indicated by what follows.

mitted them to eat blood even of irrational animals?" And after this she confessed herself a Christian and was added to the list of martyrs.

'But, when the tyrant's torments had been brought to naught by Christ through the endurance of the blessed, the Devil invented other schemes: imprisonments in cells of darkness and in the most loathsome places, stretching the feet in the stocks, separated to the fifth hole,²⁷ and the other outrages such as raving attendants, and others also filled with the Devil, are accustomed to inflict upon their prisoners. Thus, the majority were strangled in prison, such as the Lord had wished to pass out of this life in this way, manifesting His glory. For, although some were tortured so cruelly that it seemed impossible for them to live even when they had received every care, they survived in the prison, destitute of human attention, being strengthened by the Lord and given power both in body and soul, and exhorting and comforting the rest. But the youths and those recently arrested whose bodies had not become accustomed to torture did not endure the burden of confinement, but died in prison.

'The blessed Pothinus, who had been entrusted with the service of the bishopric at Lyons, was over ninety years of age and very weak physically, breathing with difficulty because of the physical weakness which was already upon him. But, being strengthened by zeal of spirit through his urgent desire for martyrdom, he, too, was dragged to the judgment seat. Although his body was weakened by old age and by disease, his soul was kept in him that through it Christ might triumph.²⁸ When he was conducted by the soldiers to the judgment seat, as the local authorities and the whole multitude accompanied him, uttering all kinds of cries, as if he were

²⁷ Cf. above, 4.16.

²⁸ Cf. 2 Cor. 2.14.

Christ Himself, he gave noble testimony. On being questioned by the governor as to who was the God of the Christians, he said: "If you are worthy, you will know." Thereupon he was dragged about mercilessly and suffered manifold blows; while some nearby insulted him in every way with hands and feet, not even having respect for his old age, others at a distance threw whatever each had in his hands at him, and all thought it a great transgression and impiety to overlook any abuse against him, for they thought that in this way they would vindicate their gods. And, breathing with difficulty, he was cast into prison, and after two days he gave up the ghost.

"Then, indeed, a great dispensation of God took place, and the immeasurable mercy²⁹ of Jesus was made manifest, which has rarely happened among the brethren, although it is not beyond the skill of Christ. Those who at the first arrest had been deniers were themselves also imprisoned and shared in the terrors, for their denial was of no help to them, at this time. Those who confessed what they were were imprisoned as Christians, with no other charge being brought against them; the others, however, were held as murderers and defiled, being punished twice as much as the rest. The joy of martyrdom and the hope of what was promised and the love toward Christ and the Spirit of the Father lightened the burden of the former, but conscience greatly punished the latter, so that their faces were conspicuous among all the rest when they were led out. The former came forth gladly, with glory and much grace mingled on their faces,³⁰ so that even

³⁰ Cf. Ps. 44.14.

²⁹ The difference between the misery of those who denied Christ and the joy of those who bore witness to Him, even in their tortures, became a source of strength and encouragement to the other Christians.

their fetters rested about them as a becoming ornament, like a bride adorned with gold lace of many patterns, perfumed with the good odor of Christ,³¹ so that some thought they had been anointed with worldly ointment; but the others were downcast and depressed and ugly and filled with every unseemliness; moreover, they were insulted by the heathen as ignoble and unmanly, receiving the accusation of murderers but having lost the name that is full of honor and of high repute and that gives life. Now, when the others beheld this, they were made firm, and those who were arrested confessed without hesitation, giving no thought to the arguments of the Devil.'

After saying a little more in addition to this, they go on again: 'After this, the testimonies of their death finally separated into every form. For they wove one wreath out of various colors and all kinds of flowers and offered it to the Father. It was necessary, therefore, that the noble athletes who had endured a manifold strife and had won a great victory carry off the great crown of immortality. Now, Maturus and Sanctus and Blandina and Attalus were led to the wild beasts, for a public and general exhibition of the inhumanity of the heathen, for the days for fighting wild beasts were specially appointed because of our people. Maturus and Sanctus again passed through every torture in the amphitheatre, as if they had suffered nothing at all before, but rather as if they had already overpowered their opponent in several bouts³² and were now holding the contest for the crown. They endured again the customary running of the

31 Cf. 2 Cor. 2.15; also, above, 4.15.

32 Literally, 'lots,' but used here technically. The gladiators used to draw lots to determine who would fight.

gauntlet³³ and the violence of the wild beasts and all such things as the maddened people, some here and others there, shouted for and commanded—above all the iron chair on which their bodies were roasted, covering them with reek. Not even there did the persecutors cease, but again they raved even more, seeking to overcome their endurance. But not even thus did they hear anything else from Sanctus than the sound of the confession which he had been accustomed to say from the beginning.

‘These, then, while their life lingered long through a great contest, at last were sacrificed, they themselves having been a spectacle for the world throughout that day in place of the usual variety of gladiatorial combats; but Blandina was hung on a stake and was offered as food for the wild beasts that were let in.³⁴ Since she seemed to be hanging in the form of a cross, and by her firmly intoned prayer, she inspired the combatants with great zeal, as they looked on during the contest and with their outward eyes saw through their sister Him who was crucified for them, that He might persuade those who believe in Him that everyone who suffers for the glory of Christ always has fellowship with the living God. And when none of the wild beasts then touched her, she was taken down from the stake and again cast into the prison, being saved for another contest, that by conquering through more trials she might make the condemnation of the crooked Serpent irrevocable,³⁵ and might encourage the brethren. Although small and weak and greatly despised, she had put on the great and invincible athlete Christ,³⁶ and in many

33 The *bestiarii* were compelled to run the gauntlet before they fought with wild beasts. Cf. Tertullian, *Ad nationes* 18 and *Ad martyras* 5.

34 Crucifixion was the punishment regularly reserved for slaves and the worst criminals, and never inflicted on Roman citizens.

35 Cf. Isa. 27.1.

36 Cf. Rom. 13.14; Gal. 3.27.

contests had overcome the Adversary and through the conflict had gained the crown of immortality.

'But Attalus, who himself was called for loudly by the crowd, for he was a person of note, came in, a ready combatant because of a clear conscience, for he was nobly trained in Christian discipline and had always been a witness for truth among us. And he was led around the amphitheatre, a tablet being carried before him, on which was written in Latin: "This is Attalus, the Christian." The people were bursting with indignation at him, and when the governor learned that he was a Roman he commanded that he be taken with the rest of those who were in prison, concerning whom he had written to the emperor and was awaiting his answer.

'But the intervening time was not idle or fruitless for them,³⁷ for by their patience the immeasurable mercy of Christ was made manifest. Through the living the dead were being made alive, and martyrs gave grace to those who failed to be martyrs,³⁸ and there was great joy in the Virgin Mother, as she receive back alive those who had been brought forth as dead. For, through them, most of those who had denied were restored again and were conceived again and were made alive again and learned to confess; now alive and strong, as God made them happy, who desires not the death of the sinner but is kind toward repentance,³⁹ they approached the judgment seat in order that they might again be interrogated by the governor. For Caesar had written that they be beaten to death, but, if any should deny, that those be set free. As the local festival⁴⁰ began to be celebrated, for this

37 Cf. 2 Peter 1.8.

38 Cf. 2 Cor. 2.7; Col. 3.13.

39 Cf. Ezech. 12.23; 33.11.

40 It has been suggested with some probability that this was the meeting of the general assembly of the Gallic nations, which was held annually in August to celebrate the worship of Augustus and consisted of games, contests, and imposing ceremonies.

is well attended by all the heathen who come together for it, he led the blessed to the judgment seat, making a show and a spectacle for the mob. Accordingly, he examined them again, and as many as seemed to possess Roman citizenship, he cut off their heads, and the rest he sent to the wild beasts. And Christ was greatly glorified in those who, though they had formerly denied, now, contrary to the expectation of the heathen, confessed. For they were examined privately as if, indeed, they were to be set free, but on confessing they were added to the list of the martyrs. Indeed, only those were untouched who never had a trace of faith or perception of the bridal garment or thought of fear of God,⁴¹ but through their very mode of life blasphemed the way, that is, the sons of perdition,⁴² but all the rest were added to the Church. And when these were being examined, a certain Alexander, a Phrygian by race and a physician by profession, who had lived many years in Gaul and was known to nearly everyone for his love for God and boldness of speech (for he was not without a share of apostolic grace),⁴³ stood by the judgment seat and by signs encouraged them to confess, and he seemed to those standing about the judgment seat like one in travail. But the crowd became angry that those who formerly had denied now confessed and cried out against Alexander as if he were the cause of this. And when the governor made him draw near and asked who he was, and when he said "a Christian," the governor, becoming angry, condemned him to the beasts. They suffered under all the instruments for torture prepared in the amphitheatre and endured them to the utmost, and finally they, too, were sacrificed. Alexander

41 Cf. Matt. 22.11-13; Rom. 2.24.

42 Cf. John 17.12.

43 Cf. Acts 4.29-31.

neither groaned nor murmured at all, but in his heart conversed with God, and Attalus, when he was placed upon the iron chair and was being burned, as the reek arose from his body, said to the mob in Latin: "Behold, this which you do, is to eat men, but we neither eat men nor do anything else wicked." And when he was asked what name God had, he replied: "God has no name as a man has."

Finally, after all this, on the last day of the gladiatorial combats, Blandina was again brought in, together with Ponticus, a boy of about fifteen, and they had been brought in daily to witness the torture of the others, and attempts were made to force them to swear by the very idols, and because they remained steadfast and regarded them as nothing, the mob was roused to fury so that they had neither pity for the youth of the boy nor respect for the feminine sex, and they exposed them to all the horrors and led them in turn through every torture, repeatedly trying to force them to swear but being unable to do this. For Ponticus was encouraged by his sister, so that even the heathen saw that she was urging him on and encouraging him, and after he had nobly endured every torture he gave up the ghost. But the blessed Blandina, last of all, like a noble mother who has encouraged her children and sent them forth triumphant to the king,⁴⁴ herself also enduring all the conflicts of the children, hastened to them, rejoicing and glad at her departure, as if called to a marriage feast and not being thrown to the beasts. And after the scourging, after the wild beasts, after the roasting seat, she finally was placed in a net and thrown to a bull. She was tossed about for some time by the animal, but was insensitive to what was happening to her because of her hope and hold upon what had been entrusted to her and her com-

⁴⁴ Cf. 2 Macc. 7.21-23, 27-29.41.

munion with Christ. And she also was sacrificed, and the heathen themselves confessed that never had a woman among them suffered so many and such horrible tortures.

'But not even thus did their madness and cruelty to the saints attain satiety, for, incited by a wild beast,⁴⁵ wild and barbarous tribes are difficult to check, and their insolence found another peculiar opportunity in the dead bodies.⁴⁶ That they had been conquered⁴⁷ did not put them to shame, because they did not possess human reason; rather, this enkindled their wrath, as with a wild beast, both the governor and the people showing the same unrighteous hatred for us that the Scripture might be fulfilled, "Let him that is unlawful be unlawful still and he that is righteous be righteous still."⁴⁸ For they threw those who had been strangled in the prison to the dogs, guarding carefully night and day that none should be buried by us. And then they threw out what was left by the wild animals and the fire, partly torn and partly charred, and, of the rest, the heads together with their trunks they also guarded with a military watch for many successive days. And some raged and "gnashed with their teeth" at them,⁴⁹ seeking to take some more extravagant vengeance from them; others laughed and jeered, at the same time magnifying their idols and ascribing to them the punishment of these Christians; the more reasonable and those who seemed to some extent to have sympathy reproached much, saying: "Where is their god and what did their religion profit them, which they preferred even to their own lives?" Their conduct had such variation, but our lot was marked by great grief because

45 I.e., by the Devil.

46 The ancient Christians were always very anxious to give the bodies of martyrs a decent burial, and to preserve the memory of their graves. They at times even bribed officials to give them the dead bodies.

47 I.e., since they had been quite unable to crush the courage of the martyrs.

48 Cf. Apoc. 22.11.

49 Cf. Acts 7.54.

we were unable to bury the bodies in the earth. For neither did night avail us for this purpose, nor did money persuade, nor did entreaty put to shame, but in every way they watched, as if they would make some great gain if the bodies should not obtain burial.³

Further on they say, in addition to this: 'So the bodies of the martyrs, after being exhibited and exposed in every way for six days, and then burned and turned to ashes, were swept by the wicked into the Rhone River which flowed near by, in order that not even a trace of them might still appear upon the earth. And this they did as if able to conquer God and to deprive them of the rebirth, in order, as they said, "that they might not even have hope of resurrection,"⁵⁰ by trusting in which they introduced among us a strange and new religion and, despite terrors, going readily and joyfully to death; now let us see if they will rise again, and if their God is able to help them and snatch them out of our hands.' '

Chapter 2

Such things happened to the Churches of Christ under the above-mentioned emperor,¹ and from this it is possible to conjecture also with a reasonable conclusion what was accomplished in the other provinces. It is worth while to add to this other quotations from the same work, in which the moderation and the kindness of the martyrs already mentioned have been recorded with these very words: 'To such an extent were they emulators and imitators of Christ, "who being in the

50 All sources of this period show that the Christians of the day laid great emphasis upon the resurrection of the body. In fact, to such an extent did they emphasize it that they were in large measure responsible for the pagans' misunderstanding of it as exhibited here.

1 Marcus Aurelius.

form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,"² that, although they had attained such glory and not once or twice but many times had given testimony, and had been taken back from the beasts with burns and scars and wounds all over them, they neither proclaimed themselves as martyrs nor did they permit us to address them with the name, but if ever anyone of us by letter or by word addressed them as martyrs, they rebuked sharply. For they gladly conceded the name of martyrdom to Christ, the faithful and true witness³ and first-begotten of the dead and author of the life of God,⁴ and they recalled the martyrs who already passed on and said: "They are already witnesses, whom Christ has deemed worthy to be taken up at their confession, having sealed their martyrdom by their departure, but we are lowly and humble confessors,"⁵ and with tears they besought the brethren, begging that earnest prayers be offered that they might be made perfect. They displayed in deed the power of martyrdom, practicing great boldness toward the heathen, and they made plain their nobleness through their patience and fearlessness and courage, but before their brethren they renounced the title of martyr, being filled with fear of God.'

And again, after a little, they say: 'They humbled themselves under the mighty hand, by which they have now been greatly exalted.⁶ At that time they made defence for all, and they accused none; they released all and bound none; and they prayed for those who inflicted their tortures, just as Stephen, the perfect martyr, who said, "Lord, lay not this sin

² Phil. 2.6.

³ A martyr in the sense of one who bore witness to the faith but did not have to die for it.

⁴ Cf. Apoc. 1.5; 3.14; Acts 3.15.

⁵ The Greek word is *homologoi*, which later came into general use as *homologetai*.

⁶ Cf. 1 Peter 5.6.

to their charge."⁷ And if he prayed for those who were stoning him, how much more for the brethren.'

And again, after other matters, they say: 'For this was their greatest struggle with him, because of the genuineness of their love, that the beast,⁸ on being choked, threw up alive those whom he at first thought to have swallowed down. For they did not take to boasting over the fallen,⁹ but that in which they abounded they supplied to those in need, having the compassion of a mother; and shedding many tears in their behalf to the Father, they asked for life, and He gave it to them; and they divided it among their neighbors, having departed to God in every respect victorious. Always loving peace, and commending peace to us, they went to God with peace, leaving behind no sorrow for their mother,¹⁰ and for the brethren no strife and war, but joy and peace and harmony and love.'

Let this profitable account of the love of those blessed ones for their brethren who had fallen suffice for the sake of the inhuman and pitiless disposition of those who after this unsparingly attacked the members of Christ.¹¹

Chapter 3

The same writing of the above-mentioned martyrs includes

⁷ Acts 7.59.

⁸ I.e., the Devil. Those whom he had swallowed are the ones who had at first recanted. The confessors hoped to recover the backsliders, and so save them from the Devil's maw.

⁹ Cf. Gal. 6.4.

¹⁰ I.e., the Church.

¹¹ Eusebius's own contemporaries, especially the Donatists and Novatians, were very severe in their treatment of the lapsed, in great contrast to the charity of these martyrs.

still another story worth remembering, and no one would begrudge our bringing this to the knowledge of our future readers. It runs as follows. A certain Alcibiades among them was leading a very austere life¹ and in the beginning partook of nothing at all, but used only bread and water, and he tried to live this way even in jail. It was revealed to Attalus after the first contest which he accomplished in the amphitheatre that Alcibiades was doing well in not using the creations of God and leaving behind a form of scandal² for others. But Alcibiades was persuaded to partake of all things without restraint and he returned thanks to God; for they were not overlooked by the grace of God but the Holy Spirit was their counselor. Let this be enough on this point.

At just about that time, the followers of Montanus³ and Alcibiades⁴ and Theodotus⁵ in Phrygia were first promulgating among many their assumption regarding prophecy, (for a great many other wonderful works of the grace of God which were still being accomplished up to that time furnished a belief among many that they also were prophets), and, when dissension arose regarding the aforesaid persons, the brethren in Gaul organized their own decision, pious and very orthodox, concerning them, setting forth also various epistles of the martyrs among them who had reached perfection, which they had composed, while still in prison, for

1 This interesting passage throws much light on the state of Christianity in Lyons at this time. The Christians were very definitely worthy practitioners of the principles of their faith. They did not permit those imprisoned for the faith to suffer from lack of food and other necessities, if they could possibly reach them. Nothing more is known of the Alcibiades mentioned here.

2 A form of scandal in that it might appear to support the heretical doctrine that matter is evil, as was declared by certain Gnostics.

3 Cf. below, 5.16 n. 1.

4 This Montanist Alcibiades is to be distinguished from the confessor of the same name above. Nothing more is known of him.

5 All our information of this Montanist Theodotus is confined to this section and Ch. 16.

the brethren in Asia and Phrygia and also for Eleutherus, Bishop of the Romans at the time, acting as ambassadors for the peace of the churches.⁶

Chapter 4

The same martyrs recommended Irenaeus,¹ also, who was already at that time a presbyter of the diocese at Lyons, to the above-mentioned bishop at Rome, as the words concerned show as follows: 'We pray once more and always that you rejoice in the God, Father Eleutherus. We have persuaded our brother and comrade Irenaeus to convey this letter to you, and we beg you to hold him in high esteem, since he is zealous for the covenant of Christ. For if we had known that office acquired righteousness for anyone, we would have

6 Many assume that the Gallic martyrs favored the Montanists and urged Pope Eleutherus to be mild in dealing with them so that they would remain within the Church, and peace thus be preserved. But it seems to be clear that the Gallic martyrs, on the contrary, urged Eleutherus to support the Church in the East by condemning the Montanists, indicating that by failing to do so he would be setting himself up against the Eastern Church. Salmon (*Dict. of Christian Biog.* 3.937) well says: 'It is monstrous to imagine that Eusebius, thinking thus of Montanism, could praise as pious or orthodox the opinion of men who, ignorant of Satan's devices, should take the devil's work for God's. The way in which we ourselves read the history is that *the Montanists had appealed to Rome*; that the Church party solicited the good offices of their countrymen settled in Gaul, who wrote to Eleutherus representing the disturbance to the peace of the churches (a phrase probably preserved by Eusebius from the letter itself) which would ensue if the Roman Church should approve what the Church on the spot had condemned. . . . To avert, then, the possibility of the calamity of a breach between the Eastern and Western churches, the Gallic churches, it would appear, not only wrote, but sent Irenaeus to Rome at the end of 177 or the beginning of 178. The hypothesis here made relieves us from the necessity of supposing this presbiter to have been unsuccessful, while it fully accounts for the necessity of sending it.' Cf., also, *Cath. Encycl.*, under Eleutheros.

1 Cf. above, 4.21.

recommended him to you first of all as a presbyter of the Church, which is his position.⁷

Why need we transcribe the list of martyrs in the aforesaid writing, some of whom attained perfection by being beheaded, others of whom were thrown to the beasts for food, and still others of whom fell asleep in prison, and the number of the confessors who survived up to that time? For, whoever pleases can easily read a very full account of these matters by taking into his hands the work which, as I have said, has been included in our collection of the martyrs. But so much for what took place under Antoninus.²

Chapter 5

Report has it that the brother of Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius Caesar, when he was arraying himself for battle with the Germans and the Sarmatians, found himself in trouble, because his army was oppressed by thirst;¹ but the soldiers of the so-called legion of Melitene,² by a faith which has sustained from that time to the present in battles with the enemy, knelt on the ground according to our own custom of prayer and turned to supplications to God. Although such a spectacle indeed seemed strange to the enemy, report has it that something else still more strange overtook them immediately, for lightning drove the enemy into flight and

2 I.e., Antoninus Verus, explicitly distinguished by Eusebius from Marcus Aurelius in the next chapter.

1 In 174, the Roman army in Hungary achieved victory by the sudden occurrence of a thunder storm, which relieved the Romans of thirst and frightened the barbarians. There were, of course, some Christians in the Roman army and they considered this deliverance as an answer to their prayers.

2 So called from the place where it was regularly stationed; Melitene is a city in eastern Cappadocia, or Armenia.

destruction, and a shower upon the army of soldiers who had prayed to God refreshed it entirely as it was on the very point of perishing from thirst.

The story is related by writers³ far from our doctrine, who have undertaken to describe the times of the emperors mentioned above, and it has also been recorded by our own. While the miracle has been presented by writers outside the faith, yet, inasmuch as they were strangers to the faith, it was not confessed that this happened by the prayers of our people. But, by our own authors, as friends of truth, what took place has been handed down in a simple and guileless manner. Among these would be also Apolinarius,⁴ who has said that from thenceforward the legion which had performed the miracle through prayer received from the emperor a name appropriate to what had taken place, being called in the language of the Romans the 'Thundering Legion.'⁵ And of these matters Tertullian would be a trustworthy witness, who, when he addressed in Latin an apology for our faith to the Senate, which we have quoted before,⁶ confirmed the story with greater and clearer proof. Now he, too, writes, saying that letters of Marcus,⁷ the most wise emperor, were even in that day still in circulation, in which he himself bears

3 Cassius Dio (71.8) ascribes the miracle to the Egyptian magician, Arnuphes; Capitolinus, in his life of Marcus Aurelius, ascribes it to the prayer of the emperor; the emperor himself, on his coins, depicts Jupiter as hurling thunderbolts at the Germans. Many writers before and after Eusebius refer to this event.

4 Claudius Apolinarius, Bishop of Hierapolis; cf. above, 4.27. The reference here is in all probability to the Apology.

5 But according to Cassius Dio (35.23), and as we gather from inscriptions (*C.I.L.* 3.30), the legion certainly had this name in the time of Nero, and probably in the time of Augustus.

6 Cf. 2.2; 3.20; 3.33.

7 Tertullian, *Apol.* 5. An epistle, ascribed to Marcus Aurelius, describing the miraculous deliverance of his army, is still extant and stands at the end of Justin Martyr's first *Apology*. It is obviously the work of a Christian and was probably forged at the end of the second century.

witness that, when his army was about to be destroyed in Germany because of lack of water, it was saved by the prayers of the Christians, and Tertullian says that this emperor even threatened death⁸ to those who attempted to accuse us. And to this the aforesaid author adds the following:⁹ 'What manner of laws are these which impious, unrighteous, and cruel men enforce against us alone? Vespasian did not observe them,¹⁰ although he conquered the Jews. Trajan set them aside in part by forbidding that Christians be sought out.¹¹ Neither Hadrian,¹² although he busied himself about all superfluous matters, nor Pius,¹³ so called, confirmed them.' But let these matters be set down as anyone wills; let us go on to the succession of events that follows.

When Pothinus reached perfection with those who had suffered martyrdom in Gaul at the full age of ninety years,¹⁴ Irenaeus succeeded to the episcopacy of the diocese in Lyons,¹⁵ of which Pothinus was the ruler, and we have learned that he was a listener to Polycarp¹⁶ as a very young man. In the third of his books against the heresies he set forth the succession of bishops at Rome down to Eleutherus, the events of whose days we are now examining, as if the work had been composed at the time, and he gives the list, writing as follows:¹⁷

8 The epistle itself declares that such accusers are to be burned alive. Tertullian speaks of a 'condemnation of greater severity.'

9 Tertullian, *Apol.* 5.

10 Cf. above, 3.12.

11 Cf. 3.33.

12 Cf. 4.9.

13 Cf. 4.13.

14 Cf. 5.1.

15 I.e., in 177; cf. above, 5.1.

16 Cf. *Adv. haer.* 2.3.4; also below, 5.20.

17 Iren. 3.3.3.

Chapter 6

So, when the blessed Apostles founded and built the Church, they entrusted the service of the episcopacy to Linus. Paul has made mention of this Linus in his letters to Timothy.¹ Anencletus² succeeded him, and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement.³ He had seen the blessed Apostles⁴ and conversed with them, and still had the teaching of the Apostles ringing in his ears and their tradition before his eyes. He was not alone in this, for many were still alive at the time who had been taught by the Apostles. Now, in the time of Clement, when no little dissension arose among the Christians in Corinth,⁵ the Church in Rome sent a very appropriate letter to the Corinthians,⁶ confirming them in peace and renewing their faith and the tradition which they had recently received from the Apostles.⁷

And after brief remarks, he says:⁸ 'Evarestus⁹ succeeded this Clement, and Alexander, Evarestus; then Xystus was appointed as the sixth from the Apostles; after him, Telesphorus, who also gloriously became a martyr; then Hyginus; then Pius; after him, Anicetus. After Soter succeeded Anicetus, now in the twelfth place from the Apostles, Eleutherus holds the

1 2 Tim. 4.21.

2 Cf. above 3.13.

3 Cf. above, 3.4.

4 The identification of this Clement with the Clement of Phil. 4.3 is very doubtful. It is reasonable to suppose, however, that he knew at least the Apostles Peter and Paul.

5 Cf. The Epistle of Clement, especially 1.3.

6 Cf. above, 3.16.

7 This letter is generally known as 'the First Epistle of Clement.' Its true title is 'the Epistle of the Church in Rome to the Church in Corinth.'

8 Iren. 3.3.3.

9 On Evarestus, cf. above, 3.34; on Alexander, 4.1; on Xystus, 4.4; on Telesphorus, 4.5; on Hyginus, 4.10; on Pius and Anicetus, 4.11; on Soter, 4.19.

office of bishop. The tradition from the Apostles in the Church and the preaching of truth have come down to us in the same order and in the same teaching.¹⁰

Chapter 7

These things Irenaeus described in accord with the extracts we made from the books, five in number, which he entitled *Refutation and Overthrow of Knowledge Falsely So Called*, and in Book 2 of the same work he points out in the following words that even to his own time have examples of the divine and glorious power been left behind in certain churches, saying: 'So far do they fall short of raising the dead, as the Lord and his Apostles did through prayer; and often among the brethren through necessity or at the request of the entire local church with fasting and much supplication the spirit of the dead returned and the man was blessed by the prayers of the saints.'¹ And he says, again, after other remarks:² 'But if they will say that the Lord did such things in appearance, we will take them back to the writings of the Prophets and from them we will show that all had been so predicted about Him, and certainly came to pass, and that He alone is the Son of God. Therefore, too, His true disciples in His name receive

10 The word 'teaching' (*didache*), which all the manuscripts of Eusebius have and most editions print, makes no sense here. The word is probably a mistake for 'succession' (*diadoche*), which is definitely implied by the Latin version of Irenaeus.

1 Iren. 2.32.2. Eusebius seems to err in making this quotation from Irenaeus. As it stands in Eusebius, the sentence is incomplete. The original sentence runs: 'They [i.e., the Simonians and Carpocratians, two early heresies] fall so far short of raising the dead, as did the Lord . . . that they do not even believe that it can be done.' On post-apostolic miracles, see Cardinal Newman's *Two Essays on Biblical and Ecclesiastical Miracles*.

2 Iren. 2.32.4.

graces from Him and use it for the benefit of the rest of men, according as each one has received the gift from Him. Some drive away demons certainly and truly, so that those who themselves have been cleansed from the wicked spirits often receive the faith and enter the Church; others, too, have foreknowledge of future events, and visions, and prophetic speech; and others cure the sick by the laying on of hands and restore them cured, and, as we have said, the dead have been raised and remained with us for many years; and, but why say more? It is not possible to name the number of the graces which the Church received from God in the name of Jesus Christ who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and exercises every day throughout the whole world for the benefit of the heathen, neither deceiving any nor making profit; for, as she has received freely, she also ministers freely.³ And in another place the same author writes: 'Just as we also hear of many brethren in the Church who have the graces of prophecy and speak in all manner of tongues through the Spirit, and who bring the hidden things of men into the open for their benefit and declare in detail the mysteries of God.'⁴ So much also on the fact that different graces continued among the worthy until the times mentioned.

Chapter 8

Since, as we began this work,¹ we made a promise, declaring that we would quote at the proper time the words of the ancient presbyters and writers of the Church in which

³ Cf. Matt. 10.8.

⁴ Iren. 5.6.1.

¹ Eusebius, in the beginning of this work, makes no such promise, but in general terms proposes to mention those men who, either orally or in writing, preached the word of God. In 3.3, however, he definitely promises to do what he speaks of doing here.

they have handed down in writing those traditions which had come down to them about the canonical Scriptures, now one of these was Irenaeus, and so let us quote his words, and first of all those about the holy Gospels, which are as follows:² 'Now Matthew published among the Hebrews in their own language³ a written Gospel, also,⁴ while Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome and establishing the Church.⁵ And after the departure of these, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself also handed down to us in writing what was preached by Peter;⁶ and Luke, too, the follower of Paul, put in a book the Gospel as preached by him.⁷ Then, John, the disciple of the Lord, he who had even leaned upon His breast,⁸ himself also gave out his Gospel, while living at Ephesus in Asia.'⁹

These things he said in Book 3 of the above-mentioned work which has been quoted before, and in Book 5 he speaks about the Apocalypse of John,¹⁰ and the number of the name of the Antichrist as follows:¹¹ 'Since this is so, and since this number is found in all the good and ancient copies, and since those very ones who saw John face to face give testimony, and since reason teaches us that the number of the name of the beast according to the calculation of the Greeks appears by the letters in it, . . .'¹² And after he has gone on, he speaks

2 Iren. 3.1.1.

3 Cf. above, 3.28.

4 That is, a written as well as a spoken gospel.

5 Cf. above, 2.25.

6 Cf. 2.15.

7 Cf. 3.4.

8 Cf. John 13.25; 21.20.

9 Cf. above, 3.24.

10 Cf. Apoc. 13.18.

11 Iren. 5.30.1.

12 According to Apoc. 13.18, the number of the beast is 666. The point is that the Greek letters were used as numerals, and, if the letters in the name of the beast be so taken, they will add up to 666.

about the same subject: 'Now we are not running the risk of appearing absolutely certain about the name of the Antichrist. For, if it were necessary that his name be proclaimed clearly at the present time, it would have been spoken by him who saw the Apocalypse; for it was not even seen a long time ago, but almost in our own generation at the end of the reign of Domitian.'¹³

These things are related by the aforesaid about the Apocalypse, and he also recalls the first Epistle of John,¹⁴ introducing very many proofs from it, and also the first Epistle of Peter.¹⁵ And not only does he know, but he also accepts,¹⁶ the writing of the Shepherd,¹⁷ saying:¹⁸ 'Well then does the Scripture¹⁹ speak which says: "first of all believe that God is one who created all things and put them in order"²⁰ and so on.' And he has used some phrases from the Wisdom of Solomon almost word for word: 'The vision of God is productive of incorruption,' and 'incorruption bringeth near to God.'²¹ He also mentions the memoirs²² of a certain apostolic presbyter²³ whose name he passes over in silence, and has presented his interpretation of divine Scriptures. Further, he

13 Iren. 5.30.3. The subject is the Beast of Antichrist; cf. above 3.18.

14 Iren. 3.16.5.8; 1 John 2.18-22; 4.1-3; 5.1. On the Epistles of St. John, cf. above, 3.24.

15 Iren. 4.9.2; 5.7.2; 4.16.5; 1 Peter 1.8; 2.16; cf. above, 3.3.

16 I.e., as Scripture.

17 I.e., the *Shepherd* of Hermas; cf. above, 3.3.

18 Iren. 4.20.2.

19 Many Fathers of the second and third centuries referred to Clement, Hermas, Barnabas, and other post-Apostolic writers as Scripture.

20 Hermas 2.1.

21 Iren. 4.38.3. In this passage Irenaeus quotes freely from the Wisd. 6.19, without indicating that he is even quoting.

22 Not necessarily written memoirs, but oral comments and explanations of the Apostles and other Christians of the first generation.

23 Iren. 4.27.1; 2.28.1; 30.1; 31.1; 32.1. In this first passage, Irenaeus speaks of 'a certain presbyter who had heard it from those who had seen the Apostles.' This presbyter cannot be identified.

has made mention of Justin Martyr²⁴ and of Ignatius,²⁵ again making use of proofs from the writings of these, and he promised to give a refutation of Marcion in a special work²⁶ out of Marcion's own writings.

And regarding the translation of the inspired Scriptures by the Seventy, hear what he writes word for word:²⁷ 'So God became man and the Lord himself saved us, giving us the sign of the virgin, but not as some say of those who today venture to translate the Scripture "behold a young woman shall conceive and bear a son,"²⁸ as Theodotian the Ephesian and Aquila from Pontus translated it, both of them Jewish proselytes, following whom the Ebionites²⁹ say that He was begotten by Joseph.' After a little, he adds to this, saying:³⁰ 'For before the Romans had established their empire, while the Macedonians still held Asia, Ptolemy, the son of Lagus,³¹ being eager to adorn the library which he had established in Alexandria with such good writings of all men as were in existence, asked the people of Jerusalem to have their Scriptures translated into the Greek language. They, for they were still subject to the Macedonians, sent to Ptolemy seventy elders, the most experienced among them in the Scriptures and in both languages, and God accomplished what He

²⁴ Iren. 4.6.2; 5.26.2; 28.4. Cf. above, 4.18.

²⁵ Irenaeus nowhere mentions Ignatius, but he quotes him (*Epistle to Romans* 4) in 5.28, beginning with these words: 'A certain one of our people said, when he was condemned to the wild beasts.' On Ignatius, cf. above, 3.36.

²⁶ Iren. 1.27.4; 3.12.12. This promise appears never to have been kept. Eusebius (4.25) does mention Irenaeus as one of those who had written against Marcion, but he may have been referring to the *Adv. haer.*

²⁷ Iren. 3.21.1.

²⁸ Cf. Isa. 7.14; also, Justin, *Dial.* 71.

²⁹ Cf. above, 3.27.

³⁰ Iren. 3.21.2.

³¹ Ptolemy, son of Tagus, or Ptolemy Soter (the Preserver), King of Egypt from 323 to 285 B.C.

wished. He, wishing to make trial of them in his own way, and being suspicious lest they had made some agreement together and would conceal by their translation the truth in the Scriptures, separated them from one another and ordered all to write the same translation, and he did this for all the books. And when they had come together in the presence of Ptolemy and they had compared each his own translation, God was glorified and the Scriptures were recognized as truly divine, for they had all rendered the same material from beginning to end with the same phrases and with the same words, so that even the heathen present knew that the Scriptures had been translated by the inspiration of God. And it is not surprising that God accomplished this, who, after the Scriptures had been destroyed during the captivity in the time of Nebuchadnezzar and the Jews after seventy years had gone back to their country, then in the times of Artaxerxes, King of the Persians, inspired Esdra, priest of the tribe of Levi,³² to restore all the words of the prophets who had gone before and to restore to the people the legislation of Moses.³³ So much for Irenaeus.

Chapter 9

When Antoninus¹ had continued as emperor for nineteen years, Commodus² took over the sovereignty. In his first year,

³² Ezdra 9.38-41.

³³ This tradition appears to come from the *Letter of Aristeas*, supposedly a work of a Persian noble of the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.).

¹ I.e., Marcus Aurelius.

² On March 17, 180.

Julian³ received the episcopacy of the churches in Alexandria, after Agrippinus⁴ had fulfilled his service for twelve years.

Chapter 10

At that time, a man very famous for his learning, by the name of Pantaenus,¹ had charge of the life of the faithful here, for according to an ancient custom a school of sacred learning was established among them.² This school has continued even into our time, and we have learned that it is managed by men of great ability in learning and zeal for divine things, but report has it that at this time the above-

³ What Eusebius tells us here and what he says in Ch. 22, that he held office for ten years, is all that we know about this Julian.

⁴ Cf. above, 4.19.

¹ Pantaenus was the head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria about 180, and was still living in 193. He was succeeded by Clement, who left Alexandria about 203. Thus, the probable date of his death was about 200. The most important fact known about Pantaenus is that he anticipated Clement and Origen in the study of Greek philosophy, as an aid to theology. Origen defended his use of the Greek philosophers by appealing to the example of Pantaenus, 'who benefited many before our time by his thorough preparation in such things.' A tradition, recorded by Photius (cod. 118), that Pantaenus had been a hearer even of the Apostles themselves, cannot be accepted, since it is impossible. Except for some brief reminiscences of his teaching, which may have been drawn from his works and not only from his lectures and conversations, we have no traces of his works. According to Jerome, many commentaries of Pantaenus were in circulation in his time; Eusebius, however, does not name and probably never saw them.

² The origin of the Catechetical School in Alexandria is uncertain. Jerome probably rightly says (*De vir. ill.* 36) that there had always been ecclesiastical teachers in Alexandria from the time of St. Mark, and he is essentially echoing what Eusebius says. But such a group of teachers as might be called a school first comes to light at this time with Pantaenus as its head. Under Clement, Origen, Heraclas, Dionysius, and others it played an important part in the history of the Church until the end of the fourth century. It then disappears in the midst of the troubles of the Church in Alexandria, and its end is as obscure as its beginning.

mentioned Pantaenus was especially eminent, inasmuch as he had been influenced by the philosophical system of the so-called Stoics. They say, then, that in his very earnest disposition he displayed such zeal for the divine Word that he was appointed as a herald of the Gospel according to Christ for the heathen in the East, being sent as far as the land of the Indians.³ For there were, until then, many evangelists⁴ of the Word who took heed to apply inspired zeal in imitation of the Apostles for the increase and the establishment of the divine Word. Of these, one was Pantaenus, and he is said to have gone among the Indians, where a report is that he discovered the Gospel according to Matthew among some there who knew Christ, which had anticipated his arrival; Bartholomew, one of the Apostles, had preached to them and had left them the writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters,⁵ which writing they preserved until the aforesaid time. Pantaenus, after many good deeds, was head of the school in Alexandria⁶ until he died, by the living voice and through his writings interpreting the treasures of the divine doctrines.

- 3 Jerome (*De vir. ill.*) declares that Pantaenus was dispatched to India by Bishop Demetrius and at the request of the Indians themselves. A little later, Eusebius says that Pantaenus preached in the same land as that in which St. Bartholomew taught. Bartholomew taught in the region of the Bosphorus, but was wrongly supposed in the period of the Fathers to have taught in India. Eusebius probably and Jerome certainly had India proper in mind, and both may have been mistaken.
- 4 It is interesting to note that Eusebius speaks of preaching evangelists as if they were uncommon in his day. In the earliest days of Christianity they were called 'apostles.' Cf. the *Didache*.
- 5 If this statement be true, Pantaenus gives testimony to the existence of a Hebrew 'Matthew.' There is no evidence, however, to justify any conclusion as to the nature of this Hebrew 'Matthew' or its relation to our Greek 'Matthew.' Cf. above, 3.24.25.
- 6 Eusebius' language is very vague here, but, like Jerome, he appears to put the journey of Pantaenus in the middle of his activity at Alexandria, and has him return there to continue teaching until his death.

Chapter 11

At this time, Clement,¹ of the same name as he who of old ruled the Church at Rome and was a pupil of the Apostles,² was known for being trained in the holy Scriptures with Pantaenus. In the *Hypotyposes*,³ which he composed, he has mentioned Pantaenus by name as his teacher, and he seems to allude to this very one in the first book of the *Stromateis*, when, on referring to the more conspicuous of the successors

1 Titus Flavius Clement, according to tradition, was born in Athens, though Alexandria was the scene of his labors. The time of his birth is unknown, but it is usually set between 150 and 160. He himself, in recounting his wanderings (*Strom.* 1.11), makes Greece the starting point and Alexandria the goal of his search. Nothing is recorded about his parents, but he implies (*Paed.* 1.1) that he embraced Christianity as a convert, and this is stated directly by Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 2.2), although he may be interpreting Clement. Eusebius and Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 36,38) are irreconcilable in details and chronology, but it is clear that, on the death or retirement of Pantaenus, Clement succeeded to his office and probably had acted as his colleague before. He was head of the school from about 190 to 203, when the persecution of Severus broke out. He then left Alexandria and there is no evidence that he ever returned there. There is likewise no evidence as to where he retired. Eusebius here gives some indications of a visit to Syria, and later he is in the company of an old pupil, Alexander, afterwards Bishop of Jerusalem, and at that time Bishop of Cappadocia, in prison for the faith. This is evidence that he did not leave Alexandria dishonorably, through fear (cf. 6.6,11,14). Alexander regarded his presence as due to 'a special providence,' and gave him a letter of congratulation to the church at Antioch on the appointment of Asclepiades to the bishopric of that city (211). This is the last notice that we have of him. The time and place of his death are both unknown. He was commemorated as a saint in the early Western martyrologies on December 4, but his name was omitted in the martyrology published by Clement VIII after corrections by Baronius. Benedict XIV defended the omission in a letter to John V of Portugal, dated 1748, on the ground that since the teaching of Clement was open to suspicion he was not entitled to a place in the calendar. Eusebius gives a list of his works in 6.13.

2 Cf. above, 3.4.

3 Cf. below, 6.13. The passage in which the name of Pantaenus is mentioned is not preserved.

of the Apostles whom he had met, he speaks as follows:⁴ 'This work,⁵ indeed, is not a writing composed for display, but my notes stored up for old age, a remedy against forgetfulness, an image without art, and a sketch of those clear and inspiring words and of those men blessed and truly noteworthy (which I was privileged to hear). Of these men, one, the Ionian,⁶ was in Greece; another, in Magna Graecia; the third of them was from Coele-Syria;⁷ another, from Egypt; and others were in the East, and of these one was from among the Assyrians and another in Palestine of Hebrew origin. And when I met the last,⁸ but in power he was certainly first, having hunted him out of concealment in Egypt, I found rest. But these men preserved the true tradition of the blessed faith direct from Peter and James and John and Paul, the holy Apostles, some having received it from a father (but few were like their fathers), and they have by the grace of God come down even to us to deposit those ancestral and apostolic seeds.'⁹

4 Clement, *Strom.* 1.11.

5 I.e., his *Stromateis*.

6 Perhaps Athenagoras.

7 I.e., the district of the Lebanon.

8 Various attempts have been made to identify these teachers, but with no success. There can be no doubt, however, about the identity of 'the last,' namely Pantaenus.

9 This passage is important for the following reasons: it shows Clement's extensive acquaintance with Christians, and the close relationship maintained by all Christians, both in the East and in the West; it indicates that Clement got much of his knowledge of the faith from some teachers who had known the Apostles; it shows the remarkable uniformity of doctrine in the different parts of Christendom, in spite of the difficulties of communication; it shows how completely Clement depended on tradition for the truth.

Chapter 12

In the time of these men, Narcissus,¹ who is still celebrated among many, was well known as Bishop of the Church in Jerusalem, holding the fifteenth successive place since the siege of the Jews under Hadrian. And we have already pointed out that then for the first time the Church in Jerusalem was composed of Gentiles, following those of the circumcision, and that the first bishop from the Gentiles to guide them was Marcus.² After him the successions of bishops

1 According to Eusebius here, Narcissus was the fifteenth of the Gentile bishops of Jerusalem, counting from Marcus (136), and the thirtieth in succession from the Apostles. The beginning of the episcopacy is usually given as 190. According to the *Synodicon*, he presided over a council of fourteen bishops of Palestine held in Jerusalem (198) to consider the Paschal question, and he participated in another on the same subject in Caesarea under the presidency of Theophilus, bishop of the city. Eusebius (5.23) speaks of this synodical letter as still extant in his day, and also (6.9) records a miracle ascribed to Narcissus, by which water was changed to oil one Easter Eve, when the oil required for the great illumination failed. The sanctity of his life caused him to be slandered, and as a result he abdicated his bishopric and retired in secrecy to a remote part of the desert to live the ascetic life. The neighboring bishops, having searched for him in vain, declared the see vacant, and consecrated Dius as his successor, who in turn was succeeded by Germanicus, and he by Gordius. During the episcopacy of Gordius, the charges against Narcissus were shown to be false, and so he returned to resume the supervision of his see at the earnest request of all (cf. 6.10,11). Alexander, a Cappadocian bishop, was selected by the aged Narcissus as his coadjutor and eventual successor. Nicephorus (*H. E.* 4.19) makes Narcissus a martyr, but there is nothing to support this claim.

2 On the so-called bishops of Jerusalem down to the destruction of the city under Hadrian, cf. above, 4.5. On the destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian, and the founding of the Gentile Church in Aelia Capitolina, and on Marcus the first Gentile bishop, cf. 4.6. The list given here by Eusebius professes to present fifteen names, but gives only thirteen from Marcus to Narcissus. Moreover, Eusebius says that Narcissus is the fifteenth. By comparing the *Chronicon*, we find that after Capito the names of Maximus II and Antoninus should be inserted. Scholars are quite unable to determine the dates of these various bishops, with the exception of Narcissus. With this same exception, nothing is known about any of them beyond the fact of their being bishops.

here record that Cassian was bishop, and after him Publius, then Maximus,³ and, besides these, Julian, then Gaius,⁴ and after him Symmachus and another Gaius, and again another Julian, and, besides these, Capito⁵ and Valens and Dolichianus, and, in addition to all these, Narcissus who was the thirtieth from the Apostles in regular succession.

Chapter 13

At this time, also, Rhodo,¹ by race of the people of Asia, who had been taught at Rome, as he himself relates, by Tatian, with whom we became acquainted above,² wrote various books, and among others directed one especially against the heresy of Marcion.³ And he relates that in his time this heresy was divided into various opinions,⁴ listing those who caused the division and accurately refuting the false teaching devised by each one of these. But give heed to him, then, as he writes the following: 'Therefore they were at variance even among themselves, maintaining inconsistent

³ Called Maximinus by the Armenian *Chron.*

⁴ For this first Gaius, some give the name Gaianus.

⁵ The Armenian *Chron.* has Apion.

¹ Nothing further is known of him. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 37) makes the additional statement that Rhodo wrote a work *Against the Phrygians*, but in all probability he deduced this from what Eusebius tells us here. The works of Rhodo are no longer extant, and the only fragments in existence are those given by Eusebius here.

² Cf. above, 4.29.

³ Cf. 4.11.

⁴ It is to be noted that Eusebius says 'opinions,' not 'sects' or 'parties.' Although the various Marcionites held different theoretical beliefs, they always remained unified, and the Fathers always referred to them by one general name, Marcionites. This was because they placed chief emphasis not on doctrine but on religious spirit. In this they differed fundamentally with the Gnostics.

opinions.⁵ Apelles,⁶ one of their herd, who prided himself on his life⁷ and old age, confesses one Principle⁸ but says that the prophecies⁹ are from an opposing spirit, being won over to this view by the response of a possessed maiden by the name of Philoumene.¹⁰ And others, just as the mariner himself [Marcion], introduce two Principles. Among these are Potitus

5 The Fathers in general entirely misunderstood Marcion and the significance of his movement. They regarded the heresy as akin to Gnosticism. Although Marcion did not stress the speculative and theological, his opponents were concerned only with this. Marcion wanted a Christianity undefiled by association with Judaism. Christianity was the New Covenant pure and simple. Abstract questions on the origin of evil or on the essence of the Godhead interested him little. The Old Testament, however, was a scandal to the faithful and a stumbling-block to the refined and intellectual Gentiles because of its crudity and cruelty, and so it had to be set aside. But a distinction has to be made between the doctrine of Marcion himself and that of his followers. Some fell away completely from Marcion's practical religious spirit, being led astray by the attractions of the speculative theological, on which, as we have indicated, Marcion laid little emphasis and often spoke loosely and inconsistently. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.*, art. *Marcionites*.

6 Apelles, the greatest and the most famous of the disciples of Marcion, died at an advanced age late in the second century. All our information about him is obtained from Rhodo as quoted by Eusebius here and from Tertullian's *Prescription against Heretics* 30. Tertullian also wrote a special work against him, but this is lost. He separated from Marcion in Rome, and went to Alexandria. There he met Philoumene, whose utterances he regarded as inspired. He collected her oracles in a book entitled *Manifestations*, and also wrote an extensive work, *Syllogismoi*, which was an attack on Mosaic theology. The personality and moral character of Apelles are portrayed quite differently by Rhodo and Tertullian. Knowing Tertullian's attitude toward heresiarchs in general, we are inclined to believe Rhodo. There seems no justification for questioning the high moral character of Apelles or of his master, Marcion.

7 Rhodo insinuates that Apelles was not sincere, but does not question the purity of his life.

8 'Source of being,' 'Beginning,' or, almost, 'God.'

9 Of the Old Testament.

10 All the reports which we have about Apelles mention the virgin Philoumene. She is said to have been regarded by Apelles as a prophetess who worked miracles and received revelations from an angel.

and Basilicus.¹¹ These followed the wolf of Pontus¹² and on not perceiving the division of things, as that one failed to do, turned reckless and announced two Principles baldly and without proof. Others, again, after them ran into worse error and supposed not only two but even three Natures. Of these the chief and leader is Syneros,¹³ as those who put forth his teaching say.⁷

The same writer [Rhodo] declares that he entered a conversation with Apelles, describing it thus: 'For the old man Apelles, when he associated with us,¹⁴ was convicted of making many false statements. Therefore he used to say that it was not necessary to examine opinion fully, but that each one should abide by what he believed. For he declared that those who place their hope on the Crucified would be saved, if only they be discovered in good works,¹⁵ but the most obscure matter of all that he taught was, as we have said before, about God. For he kept saying that there is one Principle just as our doctrine states.' Then, after setting forth his own opinion fully, he adds these words: 'And when I said to him: "What is the source of this proof of yours, or how can you say that there is one Principle? Tell us," he said that the prophecies refuted themselves because they said nothing at all true, for they are at variance and false and

11 Potitus and Basilicus are not mentioned elsewhere.

12 I.e., Marcion, said to have been the son of a Bishop in Pontus.

13 Syneros is not mentioned elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the Marcionites did not split into various sects. They all remained Marcionites, in spite of their different opinions.

14 Like Marcion, Apelles wished to keep within the Church, and to associate with her people. He had no esoteric teaching which he wished to keep concealed from the multitude, and in this he differs greatly from the Gnostics. Marcion left the Church only under compulsion, and founded his own church only after he was out of the Catholic community.

15 This clearly reveals the religious character of Marcionism as contrasted with the speculative and theological character of the Gnostics, and even of some of the Fathers.

self-contradictory. As to how there is one Principle, he said that he did not know, but that he was only inclined to believe this. Then, when I adjured him to speak the truth, he swore that he spoke the truth when he said that he did not know how the unbegotten God is one, but that he believed it. And I laughed and looked down upon him because, when he professed to be a teacher, he did not know how to confirm what he taught.¹⁶

In the same work, when addressing Kallistio,¹⁷ the same writer acknowledges that he received instruction in Rome from Tatian, and he says that a book of Problems was prepared by Tatian, in which Tatian promised to set forth what was unclear and hidden in the divine Scriptures, and Rhodo himself in his own work announces that he will set out the solutions to Tatian's Problems.¹⁸ There is also in circulation by the same author [Rhodo] a treatise on the Hexaemeron.¹⁹ This Apelles indeed uttered countless impieties against the Law of Moses, and by many writings blasphemed the divine words, having exercised no little zeal, as it seemed, for their refutation and overthrow.²⁰ So much, then, about these matters.

16 Note a true Gnostic sentiment in contrast to the pious 'agnosticism' of Apelles.

17 Nothing more is known of him.

18 It is not known whether Rhodo ever fulfilled his promise; the work is mentioned nowhere else.

19 The Narrative of Creation in six days. Nothing at all is preserved of this work. For other works on the same subject, cf. below, 6.22.

20 Hippolytus (10.16) refers to works of Apelles against the Law and the Prophets. Actually, only one work of Apelles is known. This is the *Sylogismus*, a work devoted to the criticism of the Old Testament, and containing the antitheses of Marcion in syllogistic form. Origen (*In Gen.* 2.2) and Ambrose (*De parad.* 5.28) through quotation preserve a few fragments, Ambrose from Book 38, so it apparently was a very extensive work. Since Eusebius says, 'as it seemed,' he himself probably never saw the work.

Chapter 14

The Enemy of the Church of God, who is especially a hater of good and a lover of evil, and has overlooked no means of any kind for plotting against men, was again active in producing strange heresies against the Church.¹ Some of these, like poisonous reptiles, crawled over Asia and Phrygia, boasting that Montanus was the Paraclete and that the women among his followers, Priscilla and Maximilla, were prophetesses of Montanus.²

Chapter 15

Others flourished in Rome, and their leader was Florinus,¹ who had fallen from the presbyterate of the Church, and Blastus with him, who had been caught in a similar fall. These drew many away from the Church and brought them over to their own opinion, each in his own way striving to introduce innovations about the truth.

Chapter 16

Now, against the so-called Cataphrygian¹ heresy, the power which is the defender of the truth raised up a powerful and

1 Cf. above, 4.7.

2 Cf. 5.16.

1 Cf. 5.20.

1 I.e., Montanist. Montanism is not a heresy in the usual sense of the term, since the movement had reference to life and discipline rather than to theology. The Montanists arose in the second century and were first known as Phrygians or 'those among the Phrygians' (*hoi kata Phrygos*), then as Montanists, Pepuzians, and, in the West, Cataphrygians. Their founders were the prophet, Montanus, and the two prophetesses, Maximilla and Prisca, also called Priscilla.

invincible weapon at Hierapolis, namely, Apolinarius, of whom our work has made mention before,² and many others with him of the learned men of that day, by whom a great groundwork for history has been left behind to us. Now, one

Montanus was born a pagan and an idol priest (Didymus, *De triv.* 3.41). There is no evidence to support the belief that after his conversion he became a priest or a bishop. His fundamental doctrine was that God's supernatural revelations did not end with the Apostles, but that even more wonderful manifestations of the divine energy could be expected under the dispensation of the Paraclete. Montanus is said by some to have claimed to be himself the Paraclete. He claimed rather to be an inspired organ by whom the Paraclete spoke. Consequently, his words were uttered and accepted as those of that Divine Being. It does not necessarily follow that he claimed to be the Paraclete.

The prophesying of Montanus was soon surpassed by two female disciples, Prisca or Priscilla and Maximilla. These women fell into strange ecstasies, delivering while in this condition what Montanus and his followers regarded as divine prophecies. They had been married, left their husbands, and were given by Montanus the rank of virgins in his church. Some of the neighboring bishops, however, found a strong similarity between their frenzied utterances and those heathen orgasms which the Church was accustomed to ascribe to the operation of demons. Apparently, no offence was taken at the substance of the Montanistic prophesyings. The Paraclete ordered a few fasts and abstinences; the latter were strict *xerophogiae*, but only for two weeks in the year, and even then the Saturdays and Sundays did not count. Cf. Tertullian, *De jej.* 15. Virginity was strongly recommended as always by the Church and, in addition, second marriages were disapproved. Priscilla declared chastity to be a preparation for ecstasy. They believed, too, in the speedy coming of Christ to establish His kingdom on earth, which was also prophesied. Accordingly, they were pre-Millenarians or Chiliasts. What condemned these prophesyings in the minds of the authorities of the Church was the frenzied ecstasy in which they were delivered. It is difficult to determine how soon their excommunication took place in Asia. Some bishop probably excluded the followers of Montanus from the beginning, and this action was becoming common before the death of Montanus. It was not a general rule, however, much before the death of Maximilla in 179. The sect gained much popularity in Asia Minor and in North Africa, and for a time in Rome itself, and it appears that some Churches were entirely Montanist. The extravagances of the sect arose after the deaths of the three first prophets.

The greatest convert was Tertullian. He attached himself to Montanism in 201 or 202, attracted by the asceticism and disciplinary rigor of the sect, and until his death he remained its most powerful supporter. The following of Tertullian cannot have been very large,

of the aforesaid, when he began his work³ against them, first indicates that he had also entered an oral controversy against them. He makes his introduction in the following manner: 'For a very long and sufficient time, my dear Abercius Marcellus,⁴ I have been urged by you to compose a treatise against the heresy of those called after Miltiades,⁵ but somehow I have continued in a state of reluctance until now, not because of any lack of ability to refute the falsehood and to bear testimony to the truth, but because of my fear and scruples lest in some way I appear to some to be adding to or extending the word of the new covenant of the Gospel,⁶ to which one who has chosen to live according to the Gospel cannot add and from which he cannot take away. But, when I was at Ancyra⁷ in Galatia recently, and perceived that the local church was disturbed by this new, not prophecy, as they say, but much rather, as will be shown, false prophecy, in so

but a Tertullianist sect survived him and its remains were reconciled to the Church by St. Augustine. Cf. *Haer.* 86.

The entire sect was excommunicated in Asia Minor before the end of the second century. Later, the condemnation was approved in Rome as well as in North Africa. Gradually, Montanism degenerated, and finally, after two or three centuries, disappeared entirely.

The chief sources for our knowledge of Montanism are: the writings of Tertullian, Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48, 49, Jerome's Epistle to Marcella (*Migne, Ep.* 41), the fragments of the anonymous anti-Montanistic writer quoted by Eusebius in this and the following chapter, and fragments of Apollonius' work, quoted in Ch. 18. The works of the Montanists themselves, except for Tertullian, have entirely disappeared. However, a few 'Oracles' or prophetic utterances of Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla have been preserved by Tertullian and others. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.*, s.v.

2 Cf. 4.21,26,27; 5.5.

3 Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 37) ascribes this work to Rhodo, but its authorship is quite unknown.

4 Bishop in the time of Marcus Aurelius, and probably held office for twelve or fifteen years.

5 Apparently a leader of the Montanists.

6 Cf. Apoc. 22.18,19.

7 One of the three principal cities of Galatia; modern Angora occupies its site.

far as it was possible and opportunity permitted, we disputed for many days in the church about these people themselves and matters brought up individually by them, so that the Church rejoiced and was strengthened in the truth, and those of the opposition were crushed for the moment, and our adversaries grieved. Therefore, the local presbyters asked us to leave behind some record of what had been said against the opponents of the Word of the truth, when Zoticus⁸ of Otrous, our fellow presbyter, was also present. We did not do this, but we promised to write from home, when the Lord granted, and to send it to them speedily.'

After having said these and then other similar things in the beginning of his treatise, he proceeds with the narration of the cause of the above-mentioned heresy in the following manner: 'So their opposition and renowned heretical schism from the Church had the following cause. There is said to be in Mysia near Phrygia a certain village called Ardabav.⁹ There, they say, first, that a certain one of the recent converts, Montanus by name, when Gratus was proconsul¹⁰ of Asia, in an unrestrained desire of soul for primacy¹¹ gave to the

8 Nothing more is known of this Zoticus. Otrous (Otrys) was a small town in Phrygia, about two miles from Hierapolis. The Bishop of Otrous was present at the Council of Chalcedon and at the second Council of Nicaea.

9 Not in Phrygia as is often said, but in Mysia, although the boundary between the two districts were very indefinite. Nothing is known about Ardabav. It should be noted that the explicit statement that Montanus was born in Ardabav is not made, although this may with some confidence be assumed.

10 It is impossible to fix the exact date of the rise of Montanism. The date of the proconsulship of Gratus cannot be fixed, and so this rather definite statement is of little help. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 48) says that it arose in the nineteenth year of Antoninus Pius (156-157), but Epiphanius' figures are confused and contradictory. In all probability, Montanism began some time before the date given by Eusebius. Montanus may even have begun his work before the end of the reign of Antoninus Pius.

11 Ambition on the part of some individual person was regularly regarded by the Fathers of the Church as the occasion of the various heresies and schisms.

Adversary access to himself, and became obsessed, and, falling suddenly into a kind of frenzy and distraction, raved and began to babble and utter strange things, prophesying contrary to the custom of the Church according to the tradition and the succession of the Church from the beginning.¹² Some of those who at that time were within hearing of the bastard utterances were angry at him as being possessed and being controlled by a devil and in a spirit of error and as disturbing the populace; they censured him, and forbade him to talk, remembering the distinction¹³ made by the Lord and his warning to be on guard against the coming of false prophets; and others, elevated by a holy spirit and a prophetic grace and not a little puffed up, forgot the Lord's distinction and encouraged the maddening and seducing and people-misleading spirit, being cheated and deceived by it until it no longer was kept in check so as to keep silence. And by some device, rather, by a scheme of evil planning, the Devil devised destruction for the disobedient and, being honored by them unworthily, excited and inflamed their understanding which had been lulled to sleep away from the faith according to truth, so that he even roused two more women¹⁴ and filled

12 As indicated above, the Church found no fault with the substance of Montanus' prophecy, but with the form. The form of prophecy employed by Montanus was only a revival of the form employed in earlier years, but a great change in this respect had come over the Church since the apostolic age. While the Christians were quite familiar with prophecy in their own time, they were no longer willing to accept it through an ecstatic and frenzied utterance. Clement (*Strom.* 1.17) calls the speaking in ecstasy a mark of a false prophet, and Origen (*Contra Cels.* 7.11), several decades later, denied that prophets existed even in the time of Celsus.

13 Between true and false prophets. Cf. Matt. 7.15.

14 Maximilla and Priscilla or Prisca, mentioned 5.14. They were greatly revered by the Montanists, who in many localities were called, after the latter, Priscillianists. The Montanists insisted on the complete religious equality of men and women. Human beings were but instruments of the Spirit, who might choose anyone, man or woman, ignorant or learned, as his mouthpiece. Tertullian (*De anima* 9) refers to a woman of his church, who, he believed, regularly received revelations from God.

them with the bastard spirit, with the result that they babbled insanely and improperly and strangely, like the aforesaid Montanus. And the spirit¹⁵ pronounced them blessed as they rejoiced and were conceited over him, and puffed them up by the magnitude of its promises. Sometimes it condemned them openly, wisely, and faithfully, that it might appear also to be critical, but few were those of the Phrygians who were deceived. But, when the arrogant spirit taught to blaspheme the entire Catholic Church in the whole world, because the spirit of false prophecy received neither honor from it nor entrance into it, and when the faithful in Asia had gathered together for this purpose¹⁶ and had examined the recent utterances and pronounced them profane and rejected the heresy, then at last they [the Montanists] were expelled from the Church and were excommunicated.'

These things he related in the beginning, and throughout the whole work he brings in proof of the error among them, and in Book 2 he speaks as follows about the end of the aforesaid: 'Since, then, they even called us slayers¹⁷ of the prophets, because we did not accept their unrestrained prophets (for they say that these are the ones whom the Lord announced that He would send to the people),¹⁸ let them give answer to us before God. Is there anyone, finest of men, who began to babble after Montanus and the women,

15 The false spirit speaking through Montanus. It should be noted that Abercius believed in the supernatural power of Montanus, but ascribed it to the Devil rather than to the Holy Spirit.

16 It is not surprising to hear that synods were held to consider the menace of Montanism. Just where and when they were held is not known. There is late and weak authority (*Libellus synodicus*) for one having been held at Hierapolis under Apolinarius, twenty-six bishops attending, and another at Anchialus under Sotas, twelve bishops attending.

17 Probably used in a figurative sense, to point out the hostility of the Church against the Montanists. The Church had no power to put heretics to death, even had it so desired.

18 Cf. John 14.26.

who was persecuted by Jews or killed by the wicked?¹⁹ No one. Was there not at least someone who was overpowered and crucified for the name? No, there was not.²⁰ But, was not some one of the women ever flogged in the synagogues of the Jews or stoned? No, never anywhere. But Montanus and Maximilla are said to have died by a different death. For there is a report that they each at the instigation of a maddening spirit hung themselves²¹ at different times, and at the time of the death of each there was much gossip that they had died thus and that they had destroyed their lives like the traitor Judas. Thus, too, a widespread report holds that that remarkable man, the first steward, as it were, of their so-called prophecy, a certain Theodotus,²² was sometimes taken up and received into heaven, and fell into trances, and entrusted himself to the spirit of deceit, and was hurled down and died miserably.²³ At least they say that this happened so. But let us not think that we know any of these things when we did not see them, my friend. Perhaps Montanus and Theodotus and the above-mentioned women died in this manner, and perhaps they did not.'

Again, in the same treatise, he says that the holy bishops of that time tried to refute the spirit that was in Maximilla, but were prevented by others who evidently co-operated with the spirit, and he writes as follows: 'And let not the spirit that

19 Cf. Matt. 23.34.

20 A direct contradiction to statements by the same author in 5.21. The Montanists had many martyrs. In fact, their principles led them to martyrdom very readily. Cf. Tertullian, *De fuga in persecutione*.

21 Undoubtedly a falsification.

22 A prominent Montanist, to be distinguished from the two Theodoti mentioned in 5.28. All that is known of the present Theodotus is limited to this reference and that in 5.3.

23 Little credence is to be placed in this report. It is reminiscent of the death traditionally ascribed to Simon Magus, who with the aid of demons attempted to fly up to heaven, and when in mid air fell and was killed.

speaks through Maximilla say in the same book according to Asterius Orbanus,²⁴ "I am driven away from the sheep, like a wolf. I am not a wolf. I am word and spirit and power." But let him show clearly and prove the power in the spirit, and let him through the spirit force those to confess who were then present for the purpose of testing and conversing with the spirit as it spoke—eminent men and bishops, Zoticus²⁵ from the village of Cumane,²⁶ and Julian²⁷ from Apamea, whose mouths the followers of Themiso²⁸ muzzled, and did not permit the false and people-seducing spirit to be refuted by them.'

Again, in the same work, meanwhile having said other things to refute the false prophecies of Maximilla, he both indicates the time when he wrote this and quotes her predictions, in which she prophesied that there would be wars and revolutions. He corrects the falsehood of these in the following words: 'How has this falsehood also not already been made evident? For to this day it is more than thirteen years since the woman died, and neither partial nor complete war has broken out in the world; rather, even for Christians, a continuous peace²⁹ by the mercy of God.'

24 Asterius Orbanus or Urbanus, a Montanist who wrote a work in defense of that sect. Nothing further is known of him.

25 All that is known of this Bishop Zoticus is to be found here and in 5.18.

26 A small village in Pamphylia.

27 Nothing more is known of him. His city was Apamea Cibotus or Ciboti, probably a small village on Mount Signia in Pisidia.

28 A prominent Montanist, after the death of Montanus, probably the head of the sect. He is mentioned again in 5.28 as a confessor and as an author of a catholic epistle.

29 Probably the period before the wars of Septimus Severus, no later than 192, the close of the reign of Commodus. There were no important wars in the reign of Commodus, and the persecutions that occurred then were less violent than those of earlier reigns.

This is from Book 2. And from Book 3 I shall present short passages in which he says the following against those who boast that more of them had been martyrs: 'When, then, they are at a loss because refuted in all the discussion, they try to take refuge with the martyrs, saying that they have many martyrs and that this is a trustworthy proof of the power of the so-called prophetic spirit among them. But this, indeed, as it appears, is more untrue than anything.³⁰ For, some of the other heresies have a very large number of martyrs, and surely we shall not agree with them on this account, nor admit that they possess the truth. First of all, the so-called Marcionists of the heresy of Marcion say that they have a very large number of martyrs, yet they do not confess Christ himself according to truth.'

And after a few remarks, he adds to this, saying: 'Wherefore whenever those of the Church who have been called to martyrdom for the faith according to truth meet with some of the so-called martyrs of the Phrygian heresy, they separate from them and achieve perfection without associating with them, because of their unwillingness to agree with the spirit in Montanus and the women. And that this is true and really happened in our time in Apamea³¹ on the Meander is clear from the case of those followers of Gaius and Alexander³² of Eumeneia who suffered martyrdom.'

³⁰ A direct contradiction to a statement in Sect. 12 by the same author.

³¹ Apamea Cibotus, a commercial center in Eastern Phrygia.

³² We know only what is told us here about the two martyrs, Gaius and Alexander. They were both apparently from Eumeneia, a town in Phrygia, a short distance north of Apamea. Thraseas, Bishop of Eumeneia, is mentioned by Polycrates (Ch. 24) as a martyr.

Chapter 17

In this work he also quotes Miltiades¹ as a writer, inasmuch as he himself wrote a treatise against the above-mentioned heresy. After quoting some of their phrases, he continues, saying: 'I discovered this in a work of theirs written in opposition to a work of Alcibiades² the brother, in which he gives proof on the fact that a prophet need not speak in ecstasy,³ and I made a summary of it.' Going on in the same work, he makes a list of those who have prophesied in the New Testament, and among these he numbers a certain Ammia⁴ and Quadratus,⁵ speaking thus: 'But the false prophet speaks in ecstasy, which is accompanied by ease and freedom from fear, beginning with voluntary ignorance, but

1 Information on this Miltiades comes from the following sources: the present chapter, the Roman work quoted by Eusebius in 5.28, and Tertullian (*Adv. Val.* 5). Jerome mentions him in *De vir. ill.* 39 and in *Ep. ad Magnum*, but he clearly is drawing solely on Eusebius, and contributes nothing. He was evidently an active writer of the second century. Eusebius (5.28) quotes the author of the 'Little Labyrinth' as naming Miltiades in company with Justin, Tatian, Irenaeus, Melito, and Clement among the writers who defended truth, and who before Victor's episcopate proclaimed the divinity of Christ. Tertullian (*Adv. Valentin.* 5) names him with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus as a writer against heresy, proclaiming him in an honorable sense, '*sophista ecclesiarum.*'

2 All editors except McGiffert change this to Miltiades. This change certainly is in accord with historical fact, but the evidence of all the manuscripts is definitely for Alcibiades. Thus, we seem to have here a mistake by Eusebius himself, and as such it should appear in the text.

3 This was probably the first work to denounce prophesying in ecstasy. The practice had fallen almost into disuse until revived by the Montanists and brought into disrepute by their excesses. Alcibiades' position on the problem soon became that of the Church.

4 Ammia of Philadelphia is known only from this chapter. She apparently lived in the latter part of the first or early in the second century, and was a prophetess of considerable prominence.

5 Evidently a man of prominence in the East, and to be identified with the Quadratus of 3.37. He is to be distinguished from the Bishop of Athens mentioned in 4.23 and probably also from the apologist of 4.3.

turning into involuntary madness of soul, as has already been said. But they will not be able to show that any prophet of those in the Old Testament or of these in the New was inspired in this manner; they will boast neither of Agabus, nor of Judas, nor of Silas, nor of the daughters of Philip, nor of Ammia in Philadelphia, nor of Quadratus, nor of any others who do not belong to them.⁶ And again, after brief remarks, he speaks as follows: 'For, if the Montanist woman received the prophetic gift after Quadratus and Ammia in Philadelphia, let them show who among them succeeded the followers of Montanus and the women; for the Apostle⁷ held that the gift of prophecy must exist in all the Church until the final coming. But they would not be able to show this anywhere today, the fourteenth year after the death of Maximilla.'⁸

So much, then, does he write. The Miltiades he mentioned has left us other records also of his own zeal for the oracles of God in the treatises which he composed against the Greeks and against the Jews,⁹ replying separately to each charge in two books; besides, he composed an *Apology* against the secular rulers¹⁰ in defense of the philosophy which he held.

6 Cf. Acts 11:28; 21:10; 15:22; 21:9.

7 Cf. Eph. 4:11ff.; 1 Cor. 1:7.

8 The argument appears to be that the Montanists are not a part of the true Church, because they no longer possess the gift of prophecy, a mark of the Church. This can be understood only if it is assumed that the existing Montanistic prophets were not true prophets.

9 These works are mentioned by no one else, and, although Eusebius seems to have seen them, he does not quote from them. No fragments have been preserved.

10 Some commentators would have these words refer to the provincial governors. In all likelihood, however, they refer to the reigning emperors. The form of the phrase itself and the prevailing practice with all apologists of addressing the emperors themselves point to this. The *Apology* was evidently a learned plea for toleration of Christianity, whose pure doctrines were contrasted with the pagan teachings of pagan philosophy. It is not extant, but was held in high repute at the time.

Chapter 18

When the so-called Phrygian heresy was still flourishing in Phrygia, Apollonius,¹ an ecclesiastical writer, also undertook its refutation and composed a special work against them, proving word for word that their prophecies which were in circulation were false, and reproving the character of the life of the leaders of the heresy. Listen to him as he says the following, in these very words, about Montanus: 'But who this recent teacher is, is revealed by his works and his teaching. This is he who taught dissolution of marriages,² who made laws for fasting,³ who gave the name of Jerusalem to Pepuza and Tymion,⁴ (these are small towns in Phrygia), desiring

1 Called by the author of *Praedestinatus* (written in the fifth century and not reliable), Bishop of Ephesus. He wrote a work in five books against the Montanists. Fragments of the first three are preserved here. St. Jerome devotes an article (*Vir. illust.* 50) to Apollonius, and quotes him as saying that Montanus and his prophetesses hanged themselves. The work professes to have been written forty years after the beginning of Montanus' pretensions to prophesy. The year 210 is the most probable date for this work. It was considered sufficiently important by Tertullian to require an answer. Accordingly, he devoted Book 7 of his lost work, *De ecstasi*, to a refutation of Apollonius' claims.

2 The chief sources for the Montanistic stand on marriage are the following works of Tertullian: *Ad uxorem*, *De pudicitia*, *De monogamia*, *De exhortatione ad castitatem*. They were, of course, quite ascetic in their tendencies; they taught the unlawfulness of second marriages; they exalted the blessedness of the single state; but beyond this they did not go.

3 This was one of the chief points of dispute between Montanists and Catholics. In fact, Hippolytus (8.2; 10.21) has essentially no other complaint against them. Catholics objected strenuously to the increase in the number and the severity of fasts which the Montanists tried to impose. The chief sources of information on this dispute are: Tertullian, *De jejuniis*; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48.8; Jerome, *Ep. ad Marcellam* and *Comment. in Matt.* 9.15; and Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* 3.2.

4 Pepuza, the chief center of Montanism, was an obscure town in the western part of Phrygia. It even gave its name to the sect in many places. Montanus seems to have intended originally to gather the chosen people from all over the world into one place, there, free from all the political and social relations, to await the coming of the

to bring people together there from everywhere, who established collectors of money,⁵ who contrived the receiving of gifts under the name of offerings, who provided salaries for those who preached his doctrines, that its teaching might prevail through gluttony.'

This, then, he says about Montanus. After proceeding a little further, he writes this about his prophetesses: 'Now we show that these first prophetesses themselves, from the moment they were filled with the spirit, deserted their husbands. How, then, they did lie when they called Priscilla a virgin.'⁶ Then he continues, saying:⁷ 'Does all Scripture seem to you to prohibit a prophet from receiving gifts and money? When, therefore, I see that a prophetess has received gold and silver and expensive clothes, how shall I not reprove her?'

And again, after going on further, he says this about one of the confessors of their time: 'Moreover, Themiso,⁸ who was clothed with plausible covetousness, who did not endure the sign of confession but cast off prison bonds for much wealth, when he should have been humble on this account, boasting that he was a martyr, in imitation of the Apostle he had the temerity to compose a kind of catholic letter⁹ to instruct those who had more faith than he, and to contend with babbling words and to blaspheme against the Lord and the

Lord. When this was found to be impracticable, Montanism proceeded to set itself up in the midst of society as it existed in the outside world. Montanus built especially upon the Gospel of John (10 and 17). Cf., also, with this passage from Apollonius, Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48.14 and 49.1, and Jerome *Ep. ad Marcellam*.

5 Cf. above, 5.16. This seems to have become a part of the original plan.

6 Cf. 5.16.

7 Cf. *Didache* 11.12.

8 Cf. 5.16.

9 This letter is no longer extant. The 'blasphemy' against our Lord and His Apostles was probably the enunciation of the fundamental doctrine of the Montanists, that the age of revelation was not passed, that revelations were still given through the promised Paraclete, and that these revelations supplemented or even superseded those given the Apostles by Christ.

Apostles and the holy Church.' And again, about another of those who were honored in their time as martyrs, he writes thus: 'But not to speak about more of them let the prophetess¹⁰ tell us the story of Alexander,¹¹ who calls himself a martyr, with whom she feasts, to whom himself even many pay reverence.¹² Of his robberies and the other crimes for which he has been punished we should not speak, but the record house¹³ contains them. Who, then, forgives the sins of whom? Does the prophet the robberies of the martyr, or the martyr the avarice of the prophet? For, although the Lord said: "Do not possess gold, nor silver, nor two coats,"¹⁴ these in complete opposition have offended as regards the possession of these forbidden things. For, we will show that those among them who are called prophets and martyrs make gain not only from the rich but also from the poor and from orphans and from widows. And if they have confidence, let them halt at this point and discuss these matters, in order that, if they are convicted, they may cease in the future to give offence. For it is necessary to test the fruits of the prophet, 'for by the fruit the tree is known.'¹⁵ But, that the story of Alexander may be known to those who wish, he was convicted by Aemilius Frontinus,¹⁶ proconsul in Ephesus, not because of the Name,¹⁷ but because of his daring robberies, since he was

10 The reference is to Themiso. Themiso and Alexander seemed to have lived together.

11 Nothing further is known of him. There probably is little truth in what is said here.

12 A common charge brought against various sects in the early centuries.

13 *opisthodomos*, literally 'back room'; originally, the back room in the Temple of Athena on the Acropolis at Athens where the public treasure was kept. It was afterwards applied to any room used for this or similar public purposes. Here it is applied to a room containing the public records or archives.

14 Cf. Matt. 10.9,10.

15 Matt. 12.33.

16 Nothing is known about this proconsul; hence, the date of this occurrence cannot be fixed.

17 Of Christ.

already an offender. Then, by laying false claim to the Name of the Lord, he was released, having deceived the faithful there,¹⁸ and his own diocese, from which he came, did not accept him because of his being a robber, and those who wish to learn all about him have the public records of Asia at hand,¹⁹ and the prophet does not know him, although he lived with him for many years. By exposing this man we expose also the argument of the prophet. We can reveal the same in the case of many; if they have the courage, let them stand the test.'

And again, in another part of his work, he adds this about the prophets of whom they boast: 'If they deny that their prophets have accepted gifts, let them confess this, that, if they are convicted of having accepted them, they are not prophets, and we will present countless proofs of this. But all the fruits of a prophet must be tested. Tell me, does a prophet dye his hair? Does a prophet pencil his eyelids? Does a prophet like adornment? Does a prophet play with tables and dice? Does a prophet lend money at usury? Let them admit whether these things are possible or not, and I will show that they have taken place among them.'²⁰

This same Apollonius, in the same book, relates that at the time when he wrote his book it was actually forty years after the time when Montanus attempted his fictitious prophecy. And, again, he says that Zoticus, whom the former writer²¹ also mentioned, when Maximilla pretended to prophecy in Pepuza, resisted her and tried to refute the spirit that was

18 While in prison he pretended to be a Christian, thereby obtaining the favor of certain Christians who obtained his release through their influence with the judge.

19 This story is a striking parallel to Lucian's account of Peregrinus.

20 What is known of the asceticism and strict morality of the Montanists does not permit us to put much credence in these statements.

21 Cf. Ch. 16.

working in her, but was prevented by those who agreed with her. And he also mentions a certain Thraseas²² among the martyrs of that time. Furthermore, he says, as if from tradition, that the Saviour ordered His Apostles not to be separated from Jerusalem for twelve years,²³ and he made use also of quotations from the Apocalypse of John,²⁴ and he relates that by divine power a dead man was raised by John himself in Ephesus. And he says certain other things by which he adequately and very fully discloses the error of the above-mentioned heresy. So much for Apollonius.

Chapter 19

Serapion,¹ who, report holds, was Bishop of the Church at Antioch after Maximinus² at the time mentioned, has made reference to the works of Apollinarius³ against the above-mentioned heresy. He mentions him in his own letter to Caricus and Pontius,⁴ in which, while he, too, refutes the

22 The bishop and martyr of Eumenia, mentioned by Polycrates in Ch. 24. Nothing more is known about him than is told here.

23 Cf. Clement (*Strom.* 6.5), where the same tradition is given; also, above, 3.3.

24 Cf. the promise of Eusebius in 3.24.

1 Serapion, reckoned eighth in succession, was Bishop of Antioch from 190 to 203. Eusebius reports (6.12) that he has seen (in addition to the epistle quoted here) the following works: (1) a letter to Caricus and Pontius against the Montanists, containing a copy of a letter of Apollinarius of Hierapolis, and substantiated as to the facts by the signatures of several other bishops, including some of Thrace; (2) a treatise addressed to Domninus, who during the persecution of Severus had fallen away to the Jewish 'will-worship'; and (3), the most important work, directed against the Docetic gospel falsely attributed to St. Peter, addressed to some members of the Church at Rhossus, being led away by it from the true faith. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 41) and Socrates (*H.E.* 3.7) also treat of Serapion.

2 Cf. above, 4.24.

3 Cf. 4.27.

4 These personages are otherwise unknown.

same heresy, he continues as follows: 'In order that you may know this also, that the activity of the so-called new prophecy of this false order is loathed by all the brethren in the world, I have sent you the writings⁵ of Claudius Apolinarius who was the most blessed Bishop of Hieropolis in Asia.' And in this letter of Serapion signatures of various bishops are preserved, one of whom has subscribed himself in this manner: 'I, Aurelius Cyrenius,⁶ a martyr, pray for your good health'; and another in the following way: 'I, Aelius Publius Julius,⁷ Bishop of Debelum, a colony of Thrace. As God in heaven lives, the blessed Sotas⁸ in Anchialus wished to cast out the demon in Priscilla, and the hypocrites did not permit it.' The autograph signatures of many more other bishops, who agreed with these, are preserved in the above-mentioned work. So much for matters concerning these.

Chapter 20

In opposition to those in Rome who were disturbing the sound ordinance of the Church, Irenaeus¹ composed various letters, writing one to Blastus² *On Schism*, another to Florinus³

5 Cf. 4.27.

6 Nothing is known of him.

7 Otherwise unknown. Debelum and Anchialus were Thracian towns, on the western shore of the Black Sea.

8 Otherwise unknown.

1 Cf. above, 4.21.

2 Eusebius states (5.15) that both Blastus and Florinus enticed many away from the Church by their novel heresies. He says nothing, however, about the nature of the beliefs of Blastus. We know from another source (Pseudo-Tertullian, *Adv. omnes haer.* 8) that he was a Quartodeciman, that is, that he believed that the Passover was to be observed according to the Law of Moses, on the fourteenth of the month. From Pacianus (*Epistola ad Sympronian de catholico nomine* 2) we are informed that he was a Montanist. It was not unusual for a person to be at the same time a Montanist and a Quartodeciman. The epistle of Irenaeus to Blastus, *On Schism*, is not extant.

*On Monarchy*⁴ or *That God Is Not the Author of Evil*. For, indeed, this Florinus seemed to be defending this opinion. Because of him, too, when he was being drawn away by the error of Valentinus, the work *On the Agdoad*⁵ also was composed by Irenaeus, in which he points out that he himself had received the first succession of the Apostles. In it, near the end of his work, having found a very pleasing note of his, we will of necessity include it in this writing. It goes as follows: 'I adjure you who will copy this book, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by His glorious advent, when He comes to judge the living and the dead, that you compare what you have transcribed and correct it carefully with this copy from which you have transcribed. And you will likewise transcribe this oath and place it in the copy. Let this be said by him with profit and let it be related by us in order that we may have

- 3 For some time in the second half of the second century a presbyter at Rome, who lost his office because of heresy. He is known to us from Eusebius' two notices (5.15.20), both taken from the writings of Irenaeus. One of these is an interesting fragment of a letter to Florinus, in which Irenaeus describes his youthful remembrances of Polycarp, indicating that Polycarp, whose respect Florinus once endeavored to win, would have been grieved at his present opinions. Later writers follow the material presented by Eusebius, and contribute nothing new. Some critics find it difficult to explain the fact that Florinus is not mentioned in Irenaeus' comprehensive work against heresies, nor by Tertullian, Hippolytus, or Epiphanius. In all probability this is to be explained, as far as Irenaeus is concerned, by the likelihood that Florinus' fall into heresy occurred after Irenaeus composed his lectures against heresies and his great work. The silence of the other writers is probably due to their following Irenaeus. Whatever influence Florinus may have had during his lifetime, his name attracted no great attention after his death. What effect Irenaeus' epistles and book may have had on Florinus we do not know.
- 4 *Monarchia*, the technical term for the assertion of the Unity of the Godhead, without proper regard for the reality of the individual Persons of the Trinity. Person (hypostasis), however, was not used in this sense.
- 5 The *Ogdoad* (Greek, *ogdoas*) signified a thing in eight parts, and had a prominent place in the speculations of the Gnostics. Some of them regarded God as eightfold.

those ancient and truly holy men as the best examples of very zealous care.'

In the letter to Florinus which we have mentioned above,⁶ Irenaeus again speaks of his association with Polycarp, saying: 'These doctrines, Florinus, to speak with restraint, are not of sound judgment; these doctrines are not in harmony with the Church, and invest those who believe in them with the greatest impiety; these doctrines not even the heretics outside the Church ever dared to proclaim; these doctrines the presbyters before us, those who even associated with the Apostles, did not hand on to us. For, while I was still a boy, I saw you in lower Asia with Polycarp, moving in splendor in the royal court and trying to win favor with him. I recall the events of that time better than what has happened recently (for what we learn as children grows with the soul and becomes one with it), so that I can tell even the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and talked, his goings and comings, and manner of his life, and the appearance of his body, and the discourses which he gave to the multitude, and how he reported his living with John and with the rest of the Apostles who had seen the Lord, and how he remembered their words, and what the things were which he heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles and about His teaching,⁷ how Polycarp received them from eyewitnesses of "the word of life,"⁸ and proclaimed them all in harmony with the Scriptures. These things even then I listened to through the mercy of God that was granted me, making notes of them not on paper but in my heart; and ever by the grace of God I ruminate on them, and I am able to bear witness before God that, if that blessed and apostolic presbyter

6 *On Monarchy.*

7 Cf. John 1.1.2.

8 1 John 1.1.

had heard any such thing, he would have cried out and stuffed his ears, and according to his custom would have said: "O good God, to what times have you preserved me, that I should endure these things?" He would have fled even from the place in which he was seated or standing when he heard such words.⁹ And this can be made clear from his epistles¹⁰ which he sent either to the neighboring churches, to strengthen them, or to some of the brethren, to exhort them and warn them.⁷ So speaks Irenaeus.

Chapter 21

At the same time, in the reign of Commodus,¹ our lot changed to a milder one, as peace by the grace of God came upon the churches throughout the whole world; when, too, the word of salvation was guiding every soul of every race of mankind to the pious worship of the God of the universe, so that now many of those highly noted for riches and family, with all their household and with all their relatives, turned toward their own salvation. Now this, of course, was unendurable to the demon who hates God and who is envious by nature, and so he again stripped for battle, devising various schemes against us. In the city of Rome he brought Apol-

9 Polycarp's horror of heretics is well attested, and, according to Irenaeus, was inherited from John the Apostle. Cf. Polycarp's words to Marcion, quoted above, 4.14; also Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.3.4, quoted by Eusebius (3.28; 4.14).

10 Only one epistle (to the Philippians) by Polycarp is known; cf. 4.14.

1 180-193. This degenerate son of Marcus Aurelius brought with him as emperor at least one counterbalancing advantage. The persecutions of his father's reign ceased at least for a time in his. Popular feeling against the Christians continued, but it was no longer intensified and directed by the imperial government. As a result, the Christians increased greatly in number. Marcia, the favorite mistress of the emperor, is said by Cassius Dio (72.4) to have used her influence with Commodus and to have brought the Christians comparative peace during his reign.

lonius,² a man celebrated at that time among the faithful for his education and philosophy, to the judgment seat, stirring up one of his servants, suited for this purpose, to accuse the man.³ But the wretch entered the case inopportunately, since, according to imperial decree, it was not permitted for informers in such matters to live, and straightway his legs were broken, since the judge Perennius had decreed such a sentence against him.⁴ But the martyr, most beloved by God, when the judge very earnestly besought and begged him to make a defence of himself before the Senate, presented before all a most eloquent defence of the faith for which he was being a martyr, and he was put to death by being beheaded, as if by decree of the Senate, since an ancient law among them prevailed that those who once appeared before the judgment seat and did not change their statement should on no condition be released.⁵ The words of this Apollonius in the presence of the judge, and the answers which he gave to the questions of Perennius, and his entire defence before the Senate, anyone who pleases to read all this will find it in the collection of the ancient martyrs we compiled.⁶

- 2 Eusebius states that Apollonius delivered a very eloquent defense of the faith before the Senate, but does not indicate that he wrote an apology. Eusebius' words at the end of this chapter imply that the defense made by Apollonius was recorded after it was delivered, and that this version may be read in his *Collection of Martyrdom*. When St. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 42 and *Epist. ad Magnum* 4) calls Apollonius a Roman Senator and declares him to be the author of a 'distinguished work,' he is probably misinterpreting Eusebius.
- 3 Jerome, as well as Sophronius, states that Apollonius was accused by a slave named Severus. This information, however, is open to grave doubt.
- 4 The ground for execution would be not that he accused a Christian, as Eusebius thinks, but rather that, as a slave, he had betrayed his master.
- 5 Some believe that the reference here is to Pliny's rescript to Trajan; cf. above, 3.33. Eusebius seems rather to imply here a more general reference, that is, to all kinds of cases, not simply to those involving Christians.
- 6 Cf. *Acta Martyr. sel.*, ed. Gebhardt, p. vi; also, Introduction, above.

Chapter 22

In the tenth year of the reign of Commodus,¹ Victor succeeded Eleutherus, who had administered the episcopacy for thirteen years. In this year, also, when Julian² had completed his tenth year, Demetrius³ was entrusted with the administration of the dioceses at Alexandria, and again at this time Serapion, whom we have already mentioned above⁴ and the eighth from the Apostles, was still known at that time as Bishop of the Church at Antioch. Theophilus⁵ was in charge of Caesarea in Palestine, and Narcissus likewise, of whom our work has made mention before,⁶ still at that time had the administration of the Church in Jerusalem, and at the same time Bacchyllus⁷ was Bishop of Corinth in Greece and Polycrates⁸ of the diocese at Ephesus. And there were in these

1 In 189, but the dates given to Victor's episcopate vary greatly. Furthermore, in the testimony of most sources, Eleutherus was bishop for fifteen years. Eusebius' statement here of 'thirteen years' is an error.

2 Cf. above, 5.9.

3 He became the eleventh Bishop of Alexandria in 189 and held office for forty-three years; cf. *Chron.*; also, below, 6.26. He was a man of great energy and a successful administrator. While greatly interested in the catechetical school of Alexandria, he does not seem to have written anything himself. His relations with Origen were very friendly at first, but hostile in later years.

4 Cf. above, 5.19.

5 The dates of the accession of Theophilus to office and of his death are unknown. He was famous chiefly for his part in the Paschal controversy. Together with Narcissus, he presided over the council (5.23) called to consider the Paschal question.

6 Cf. above, 5.12.

7 When Bacchyllus became Bishop of Corinth and when he died are unknown. He may possibly be identical with the Bacchylides of 4.23, above. He also is famous chiefly for his part in the Paschal controversy.

8 While no dates are available for his accession to the episcopacy and his death, he may be said to have been Bishop of Ephesus in the last decade of the second century. Victor of Rome tried to unify the practice of the whole Christian world in the matter of celebrating Easter, and so he called for meetings of bishops in different places to report on the practice of their localities. The answer from every other

times, of course, countless other prominent men, but we have naturally given a list of those whose orthodoxy of faith has come down to us in writing.

Chapter 23

Now, at this time, no small controversy was stirred up because the dioceses of all Asia, as according to an older tradition, thought that they should observe the fourteenth day of the moon, on which the Jews had been ordered to sacrifice the lamb, as the feast of the Saviour's Passover, so that it became absolutely necessary to bring the days of fasting to an end on whatever day of the week this fell. But it was not the custom for the churches throughout all the rest of the world to end it in this way, since they preserved a custom which from apostolic tradition has prevailed to our own day, according to which it is not right to end the fasting on any other day than that of the Resurrection of our Saviour. Then, synods and conferences of bishops on the same question took place,¹ and they unanimously formulated in their letters a doctrine of the Church for people everywhere, that the mystery of the Lord's Resurrection from the dead be celebrated on no other

place except that of Polycrates was that the feast of our Lord's Resurrection was celebrated only on Sunday. Polycrates, however, speaking for the bishops of Asia, stated that they had preserved unchanged the tradition of celebrating only on the fourteenth day of the month of Nisan, the day when the Jewish people put away their leaven, whatever day of the week that might be. Thus, they were often called Quartodecimans. This letter is the only writing of Polycrates of which we know; cf. the portion quoted above, §31, and a still longer quotation in 5.24. Both Eusebius and Jerome praise Polycrates highly, especially for his orthodoxy, all of which shows to what an extent the Quartodeciman practice had become a dead issue in their time.

1 Although the *Libellus synodicus* (ninth century) mentions other synods, we are probably safe in accepting only those mentioned by Eusebius in this and the next chapters.

day than the Lord's Day,² and that on this day alone we should observe the close of the Paschal fast. There is still in circulation today a writing of those who then assembled in Palestine, over whom Theophilus, Bishop of the diocese of Caesarea, presided and Narcissus, Bishop of the diocese of Jerusalem;³ and, similarly, another of those assembled at Rome on the same problem, which indicates Victor⁴ as bishop; and of the bishops in the Pontus over whom Palmas⁵ presided as the oldest; and of the dioceses of Gaul of which Irenaeus was bishop; and still others of those in Osrhoene⁶ and the cities there; and particularly a writing of Bacchylus,⁷ Bishop of the Church at Corinth; and of numerous others who expressed one and the same opinion and judgment, and cast the same vote.⁸

Chapter 24

To these belonged the one definition which has just been indicated, but Polycrates led the bishops of Asia in confidently proclaiming that they must preserve the custom handed down to them from of old. Polycrates himself, in a writing which he composed to Victor and the Church of Rome, describes the tradition which had come down to him, in these words:¹

2 Thus, the celebration of the Crucifixion must come on Friday.

3 Cf. above, 5.22.

4 Of this and the following epistles we do not even possess fragments. Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 43.44) also speaks of them as mere memories.

5 Bishop of Amastris, in Pontus. He is mentioned by Dionysius; cf. above, 4.23.

6 In northwestern Mesopotamia.

7 The words of Eusebius seem to indicate that, unlike the preceding epistles, this was the independent production of one man and not a synodical or collective epistle. Perhaps those mentioned immediately following were of this same nature.

8 Against the observance of the fourteenth day.

1 A portion of this quotation from Polycrates' epistle is given above, 3.31.

'We, therefore, keep the precise day, neither adding nor taking away, for even in Asia great luminaries² have fallen asleep, which shall rise on the day of the coming of the Lord, when he comes with glory from heaven and shall seek out³ all the saints, Philip of the twelve Apostles, who have been sleeping in Hieropolis, and two of his daughters who had grown old as virgins, and another daughter of his who lived in the Holy Spirit and rests at Ephesus. Furthermore, there is also John, who leaned on the breast of the Lord,⁴ and was a priest wearing the breastplate, and a martyr, and teacher.⁵ This one rests at Ephesus. Then there is also Polycarp⁶ in Smyrna, both bishop and martyr; and there is Thraseas,⁷ both bishop and martyr, from Eumenaea, who rests at Smyrna. And why need I mention Sagaris,⁸ bishop and martyr, who rests in Smyrna, and also Papirius⁹ the blessed and Melito¹⁰ the eunuch, who lived entirely in the Holy Spirit and lies in Sardis awaiting the visitation from heaven when he will rise from the dead? All these observed the fourteenth day of the Passover according to the Gospel, never deviating, but following according to the rule of the faith. And I also, Polycrates, do so, the least of you all, according to the tradition of my kinsmen, some of whom I have followed. Seven of my kinsmen were bishops, and I am the eighth. And my

2 *stoicheia*, in late Greek, often means 'the planets.'

3 Some important manuscripts read *anastesei* (shall raise up) which may be the right meaning.

4 Cf. John 21.20; 13.23.

5 Cf. Exod. 28.32ff.; 36.38ff.

6 Cf. above, 4.14.

7 All evidence points to the reliability of the statement that he was Bishop of Eumenaea (in the southern part of Phrygia) and a martyr in the full sense. Nothing more is known about him.

8 Cf. above, 4.26.

9 Nothing is known about him. Polycrates calls him neither a bishop nor a martyr, but Simeon Metaphrastes, an unreliable authority, says that Papirius was a successor of Polycarp as Bishop of Smyrna.

10 Cf. above, 4.26.

kinsmen always observed the day when the people¹¹ put away the leaven. So, my brethren, having lived sixty-five years in the Lord and having associated with the brethren from the entire world and having read all holy Scripture,¹² I am not frightened at what is threatened us, for those greater than I have said, "We ought to obey God rather than men."¹³

To this he adds about the bishops who were with him as he wrote and were of one opinion with him, speaking as follows: 'I could mention the bishops who were present with me, whom you requested¹⁴ to be summoned by me and I summoned them, and their names, if I record them, are most numerous. They, having seen my feeble humanity, gave their consent to the letter, knowing that I did not bear my grey hairs in vain, but have always lived in Christ Jesus.'

Thereupon, Victor, who was in charge of the Church at Rome, immediately tried to cut off the dioceses of all Asia, together with the adjacent churches, as being heterodox, from the common unity, and he inveighed against them by letters and proclaimed all the brethren there as absolutely excommunicated,¹⁵ but this did not please all the bishops. Then they issued counter requests to him to consider the matters of peace and of unity and of love toward one's neighbors, and the words of these as they sharply rebuked Victor are in circulation. Among these, Irenaeus, too, writing in the name of the brethren whom he guided in Gaul, defends the necessity of celebrating the mystery of the Lord's Resurrection on the

11 I.e., the Jews.

12 Cf. Phil. 1:28.

13 Acts 5:29.

14 Apparently, the Asiatic Council was called at the request of Victor of Rome. This, in all probability, was true of all the councils mentioned in the last chapter.

15 The Greek text here seems to be clear. Eusebius actually says that Victor excommunicated the Asiatic churches. Some, however, hesitate to give this decisive interpretation of the passage.

Lord's Day only, but he properly and at length exhorts Victor not to cut off entire churches of God because they kept a tradition of ancient custom, and he continues with the following words:¹⁶ 'For the controversy is not only concerning the day, but also about the very manner of the fast. Some think that they ought to fast one day; others, two; others, even more; some measure their day as forty hours day and night.¹⁷ And such a variation on the part of those observing the feast did not originate now in our time,¹⁸ but much earlier in the days of our predecessors, who, as is likely, without maintaining it strictly, established a practice for the future which is simple and permits personal preference, and all these nevertheless lived in peace, and we also lived in peace with one another, and the disagreement respecting the fast confirms our unanimity in the faith.'

To this he also adds a story which I shall with propriety present, and it goes like this: 'Among those, too, were the

16 Although this epistle is not extant, a number of fragments are at hand from various sources. Apparently, Irenaeus agreed with Victor as to the proper time for keeping the feast, but did not approve his determination to excommunicate those who followed the other practice.

17 The present passage is of primary importance in any discussion of the origin of Lent. Some of the Fathers, as early as the fifth century, believed that the forty-day fast was of apostolic institution. Cf. St. Leo. (d. 461), *PL* 44.633; the historian Socrates (d. 433), *PG* 67.633, and St. Jerome (d. 420), *PL* 22.475. The best modern scholars are essentially unanimous in believing that the present practice of the forty-day fast was of gradual development and does not appear well established until the fifth century as indicated above. Irenaeus, about the year 190 as is indicated by this passage, knew nothing of any Easter fast of forty days. Tertullian, writing only a few years later, gives the same inference. Writing as a Montanist, he contrasts the very brief term of fasting as observed by Catholics with the longer but still restricted period of two weeks as kept by the Montanists. Cf. Tertullian, *De jejun.* 2, 14, *De orat.* 18, and other passages. For the entire question see the excellent article by Herbert Thurston in *Cath. Encycl.*, s.v.

18 The fast preceding the Paschal supper, which gradually became our Lent of forty days preceding Easter, can be carried back at least close to apostolic times. It was observed just about as early as the celebration of the Paschal supper was established.

presbyters before Soter, who presided over the Church which you now rule: we mean Anicetus and Pius and Telesphorus and Xystus. Neither did they themselves observe,¹⁹ nor did they enjoin it upon their followers; nevertheless, although not observing it themselves, they were at peace with those who came to them from dioceses in which it was observed, although to observe it was more objectionable to those who did not do so.²⁰ Yet, never were any cast out because of this form, and the presbyters themselves before you sent the Eucharist to those from other dioceses who did; and when the blessed Polycarp sojourned in Rome in the time of Anicetus, although they had small difficulties about certain other matters, they immediately made peace, having no desire for strife among themselves on this outstanding question. Neither was Anicetus able to persuade Polycarp not to observe it, inasmuch as Polycarp had always observed it, together with John the disciple of our Lord and the other Apostles with whom he had lived; nor, on the other hand, did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, for Anicetus said that he was obliged to cling to the practice of those who were presbyters before him. And under these conditions they communicated with each other, and in the church Anicetus conceded the celebration of the Eucharist to Polycarp, obviously out of respect for him,²¹ and they departed from each other peacefully, for

19 I.e., the fourteenth day.

20 The Romans before Victor's time did not make an issue out of the Quartodeciman practice and even permitted Asiatics visiting Rome to observe it; why, then, should not Victor permit Asiatics to follow the practice in their own land. It should be recalled that the Quartodeciman practice sometimes resulted in the Asiatics treating as Easter Day what the Romans regarded as Good Friday.

21 This passage has been the subject of some dispute, which has turned on the interpretation of the Greek word, *parechoresen*. The meaning, however, seems to be clear. Anicetus permitted Polycarp, in spite of difference of opinion on the Quartodeciman practice, not merely to *partake* of the Holy Eucharist, which was no special honor, but to *administer* or *celebrate* the sacrament.

they maintained the peace of the entire Church, both those who observed and those who did not.'

And Irenaeus, being a person well named,²² a peacemaker both by name and by very character, made exhortations of this kind for the peace of the churches and acted as the Church's ambassador; and the same Irenaeus discussed by letter, not only with Victor but also with a great many others who governed churches, the various aspects of the problem which had been raised.²³

Chapter 25

Those in Palestine, whom we have recently mentioned, Narcissus and Theophilus, and with them Cassius, Bishop of the Church at Tyre, and Clarus,¹ Bishop of the Church at Ptolemais, and those who had come together with them,² discussed at great length the tradition concerning the Passover which had come down to them from the succession of the Apostles, and at the end of the writing they added the following in these very words: 'Try to send copies of our letter into every diocese, that we may not be culpable before those who easily deceive their own souls. And we point out to you that in Alexandria, also, they keep the feast on the same day as do we, for letters are conveyed from us to them and from them to us, so that we keep the holy day harmoniously and at the same time.'³

²² The Greek form of his name is Eirenaïos, from *eirene*, 'peace.'

²³ The bishops to whom these letters were sent are unknown. In fact these letters are not extant, although portions of the epistle of Irenaeus to Victor may contain parts of them. Jerome does not mention them.

¹ Cassius and Clarus are otherwise unknown.

² I.e., in the Council at Palestine as mentioned above, 5.23.

³ These letters and all the letters written at this time on the Paschal question are now lost; cf. 5.23.

Chapter 26

In addition to the published¹ treatises and letters of Irenaeus, there is in circulation a certain treatise of his against the Greeks, very concise and extremely forceful, entitled *Concerning Knowledge*, and another which he dedicated to a brother named Marcion on the *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*,² and a book of various discourses³ in which he makes mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, quoting certain passages from them. Such is our knowledge of the writings of Irenaeus which have come down to us.

When Commodus had completed his rule after thirteen years, Severus took over the power as emperor not quite six month after the death of Commodus. Pertinax reigned in the interval.⁴

Chapter 27

Now, a great many works of virtuous zeal on the part of the ancient churchmen of that time have been preserved by many to our day, and we ourselves have read them. These would be the writings of Heraclitus on the Apostle,¹ and

1 Cf. above, 4.21.

2 Nothing reliable is preserved from these two treatises, and the 'brother named Marcion' is otherwise unknown.

3 No longer extant, but probably correctly described as 'a collection of sermons and expositions of various texts and passages of Scripture.'

4 Commodus was murdered by strangulation on December 31, 192. Pertinax, who succeeded him, was killed by the Praetorian Guard on March 28, 193, which then sold the Empire to Didius Julianus. But the Pannonian legions proclaimed Septimius Severus emperor, and marched on Rome. At the approach of these legions, Didius Julianus was declared a public enemy by the Senate, and was beheaded after a reign of only sixty-six days.

1 This Heraclitus is also mentioned by St. Jerome (*De vir. ill.*), who follows Eusebius slavishly in his account. 'On the Apostle' is the

those of Maximus on the problem, so much discussed among heretics, of the origin of evil, and on whether matter has an origin;² the works of Candidus³ on the Hexaemeron, and of Apion⁴ on the same subject; likewise, of Sextus⁵ on the Resurrection; and another treatise of Arabianus,⁶ and the works of countless others, of which, because of lack of evidence, it is impossible for us to hand down a date in writing or to make a record of their history. Writings of a great many others have come down to us, whose names we cannot even give, although they were orthodox and ecclesiastical, as the interpretation of divine Scripture as given by each shows, yet they are unknown to us because their names are not included in what they wrote.⁷

literal translation of the Greek text. This expression in ecclesiastical Greek consistently means the Epistles of St. Paul and not the Acts of the Apostles. Nothing is known of the nature of these commentaries; they are no longer extant.

- 2 Eusebius in his *Praep. evang.* (7.22) seems to quote a long extract from this work, which indicates that it was written in the form of a dialogue between three persons: two inquirers and one orthodox Christian. The same fragment is quoted by Origen (*Philocalia* 24). It has been suggested that this Maximus is identical with Maximus, twenty-sixth Bishop of Jerusalem (cf. above, 5.12), who probably lived about this time. In any case, neither here nor in his *Praep. evang.* does Eusebius call him a bishop.
- 3 Nothing further is known of him.
- 4 Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 4) mentions Apion's work, but adds nothing to our knowledge; nothing further is known of him.
- 5 Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 50) also speaks of Sextus, but all our knowledge of him and his work is what we find in this passage.
- 6 Nothing more is known of this Arabianus, whose 'treatise' is not identified by name. Jerome (*De vir. ill.*) speaks also of certain other works 'pertaining to Christian teaching,' but says nothing more, which does not give confidence in his statement.
- 7 That is, thus far works have been mentioned the names of whose authors are known to Eusebius. He knows many other works, whose contents disclose the orthodoxy of the authors but which do not bear the writers' names.

Chapter 28

In a literary effort of one of these worked out against the heresy of Artemon,¹ which Paul of Samosata in turn has tried to revive in our time, an account is being circulated which has a bearing on the history under investigation by us. For he criticizes the above-mentioned heresy which declares that the Saviour was a mere man and which was invented not long before, because those who introduced it wished to exalt it by calling it ancient.² The account brings in many other matters, also, in proof of their blasphemous falsehood and reads as follows, word for word: 'For they say that all the earlier teachers and the Apostles themselves received and taught that which they now say, and that the truth of the teaching was preserved until the times of Victor,³ who was the thirteenth Bishop in Rome after Peter, but that the truth

1 The fragments in this chapter are the only remains of this anonymous work. Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* 2.5) speaks of the work as directed against the heresies of Theodotus and Artemon, and says that it bore the title, *Little Labyrinth*. It was probably written in Rome between 230 and 240. Some have ascribed the work to Hippolytus, and it does bear some internal resemblance to the *Philosophumena*. Artemon and the Artemonites belonged to the ante-Nicene Monarchians or Anti-trinitarians who declared Christ to be a mere man filled with divine power. He taught in Rome at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century, and was excommunicated by Zephyrinus (202-217). He declared the doctrine of the divinity of Christ to be an innovation and a relapse into heathen polytheism. He asserted that Christ was a mere man, but born of a virgin, and superior in virtue to the Prophets. The Artemonites were accused of holding Euclid above Christ, and of abandoning the Scriptures for dialectics and mathematics. The ideas of Artemon were later more fully developed by Paul of Samosata (cf. below, 7.27.) who is sometimes placed with the Artemonites.

2 As a matter of fact, the Christology in question is that which Hermas represents, and which was a popular belief early in the second century. It did not, however, take, as it were, definite and scientific form until Artemon and his followers.

3 Cf. above, 5.22.

was corrupted from the time of his successor, Zephyrinus.⁴ And what they say might actually be plausible, were not, first of all, the sacred Scriptures in opposition to them, and there are writings by some of the brethren, older than the times of Victor, which these authors wrote to the Gentiles in behalf of truth and against the heresies of that time. I refer to the works of Justin⁵ and Miltiades and Tatian⁶ and Clement⁷ and many others in all of which Christ is treated as God. For who is ignorant of the books of Irenaeus and Melito and the rest, which proclaim Christ as God and man?⁸ And all the psalms and hymns written by faithful brethren from the beginning sing of Christ as the Word of God and treat him as God. How, then, if the mind of the Church has been preached for so many years, is it possible for those just before Victor to have proclaimed it as they say? And how are they not ashamed so to calumniate Victor, when they know full well that Victor excommunicated Theodotus the cobbler, the

4 Bishop of Rome after Victor, under Emperors Septimius Severus and Caracalla. His episcopate extended from 198 or 199 to 217, and was marked by serious disturbance at Rome due to doctrinal controversies and consequent schism. Hippolytus, in *Philosophumena* 9, paints detailed pictures of Zephyrinus and Callistus. Among other things, he calls the former ignorant and illiterate and says that he was under the guidance of Callistus, who was a man of more practical ability. Callistus and his learned opponent Hippolytus appear to have been the leading spirits of the time at Rome. The two important heresies of the time were Montanism and Monarchism. The see of Rome under Zephyrinus declared against Montanism, as we have seen. But neither he nor Callistus is free from the imputation at least of having tolerated that school of Monarchism which Praxeas introduced to Rome.

5 On Justin, cf. above, 4.11; on Miltiades, 5.17.

6 On Tatian, cf. 3.29. The fact that this work speaks of Tatian with respect here is an argument against an authorship by Hippolytus, who devotes two chapters of his *Philosophumena* (8.9;10.14) to the heresy of Tatian.

7 On Clement of Alexandria, cf. 5.11; on Irenaeus, 4.21; on Melito, 4.26.

8 Irenaeus was the first to bring out clearly and emphatically the God-manhood of Christ.

originator and father of this God-denying apostasy, when he first said that Christ was a mere man? For, if Victor was so minded toward them as their blasphemy teaches, how would he have thrown out Theodotus, the inventor of this heresy?

So much for the events of Victor's time. After he had been in charge of the service of his church for ten years, Zephyrinus was appointed as his successor in about the ninth year of the reign of Severus.⁹ And he who composed the above-mentioned book about him who founded the heresy referred to adds another incident that happened in the time of Zephyrinus, writing as follows, in these very words: 'I will at least remind many of the brethren of a matter that occurred in our time, which I think, had it happened in Sodom, would probably have been a warning even to those men.'¹⁰ There was a certain confessor, Natalius,¹¹ who lived not long ago, but in our own time. This man on a certain occasion was deceived by Asclepiodotus¹² and by a second Theodotus,¹³ a banker. These were both disciples of Theodotus the cobbler, who was first excommunicated by Victor, as I have said, bishop at the time, for this way of thinking or, rather, lack of thinking. They persuaded Natalius to be called bishop of this heresy, with a salary, so that he received from them one hundred and fifty denarii a month.¹⁴ Now, when he was with them, he was often warned by the Lord through visions,

9 In 201, but this date may be too late.

10 Cf. Matt. 11:23.

11 Nothing further is known of him.

12 Otherwise unknown.

13 This second Theodotus, the banker or money-changer, is to be distinguished from Theodotus the cobbler mentioned above.

14 This is the first clear instance of the payment of a bishop. But this practice was followed by the Montanists (cf. above, 5.18), and brought great reproach upon them. Natalius' monthly salary was slightly more than twenty-five dollars.

for our compassionate God and Lord, Jesus Christ, did not wish that one who had been a witness to His own sufferings¹⁵ should perish outside the Church. And when he paid rather indifferent attention to the visions, being ensnared by the first position among them and by the shameful covetousness that destroys most men, he at last was scourged by holy angels an entire night and was tormented no little, so that he arose in the morning, put on sackcloth, covered himself with ashes, and with great haste and tears fell down before Zephyrinus, the bishop, rolling at the feet not only of the clergy but also of the laity, and by his tears he moved the compassionate Church of the merciful Christ, and, although he employed much supplication and showed the welts of the stripes which he had received, he was admitted into communion with difficulty.'

To this we will add other words of the same author on the same persons, and they go as follows: 'They have tampered with the divine Scriptures without fear; they have set aside the rule of ancient faith; they have not known Christ, seeking not what the divine Scriptures say, but laboriously striving after the discovery of some sort of syllogistic figure for the support of their atheism. If any one place before them a passage of divine Scripture, they inquire whether a conjunctive or disjunctive syllogism can be made of it. They have abandoned the holy Scriptures of God and are interested in geometry,¹⁶ for they are of the earth and talk of the earth and Him who comes from above they do not know. Among some of them the geometry of Euclid is laboriously studied, and Aristotle and Theophrastus are admired. Galen is, perhaps, even worshiped

15 I.e., 'had been a confessor,' a witness in court to the 'sufferings of Christ.'

16 The Greek *geometria* etymologically means 'earth measurement.' Thus, the play on words is achieved.

by some.¹⁷ As for those who make use of the arts of the faithless for their own opinion of their heresy and by the cunning of the godless corrupt the simple faith of the divine Scriptures, why need I even say that they are not even near faith? For this reason have they fearlessly laid their hands on divine Scriptures, saying that they have corrected them. That I say this without calumniating them he who wishes can learn. For, if anyone wishes to gather together the copies of each of them and to compare them one with another, he would find them in great disagreement. For example, those¹⁸ of Asclepiades are not in agreement with those of Theodotus, and it is possible to provide the copies of many because their disciples have diligently written out the corrections, as they call them, that is, the corruption of each of them. Further, the copies of Hermophilus¹⁹ do not agree with these. Those of Apolloniades do not even agree with themselves. For it is possible to compare those which they first prepared with those which were again corrupted later and to find them in great disagreement. In all probability they are by no means unaware of the great imprudence of this sin, for either they do not believe that the divine Scriptures were spoken by the Holy Spirit, and are without faith, or they think that they are wiser than the Holy Spirit, and in this case what else are they than demoniacs? For they cannot even deny that the crime is theirs, since the copies are written in their own hand, and they did not receive the Scriptures in this condition from those by whom they were taught, and they cannot show the originals from

17 The Greek verb is *geometreitai*, and the literal translation is: 'Euclid is *geometrized*.' Apparently, the aim of this passage is to emphasize that these persons tried to introduce Greek learning generally into the interpretation of Scripture.

18 i.e., the copies of Scripture used by Asclepiades. The Roman heretics were, apparently, adept in the field of textual criticism. At least, they were unable to resist the temptations of conjectural emendation.

19 Otherwise unknown.

which they transcribed their copies. Some of them have not even seen fit to corrupt the Scriptures, but have simply denied the Law and Prophets, and because of their lawless and atheistic teaching with a pretense of grace have sunk to the lowest depth of perdition.'

Let so much suffice on this subject.